

the public building in the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12796) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to remodel and repair the present post-office and subtreasury building and the appraisers' stores building at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 12797) to amend an amendment to an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 12798) granting a pension to A. W. Dumm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12799) granting an increase of pension to Carl F. Gatterdam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12800) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius D. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12801) granting an increase of pension to Donald A. Nicholson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12802) granting a pension to Frazier Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12803) for the relief of John Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 12804) granting a pension to Charles Cranmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 12805) to authorize the commissioning of Dr. Hugh Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12806) for the relief of Peter Swartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12807) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12808) granting a pension to Catherine Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12809) granting an increase of pension to Aaron C. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 12810) granting an increase of pension to William Middagh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12811) granting a pension to Huston Frey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12812) granting a pension to Holman B. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12813) granting a pension to Samuel Walls; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12814) granting a pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 12815) granting a pension to Jane Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1904. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the city council of the city of Portland, Oreg., indorsing the action of the American Association of State Highway Officials, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1905. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of the Wallace S. Chute Post, No. 76, of the American Legion, opposed to the proposed bonus for the soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1906. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of 16 citizens of California, protesting against the sale by the United States Shipping Board of former German ships seized by the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1907. Also, petition of the members of the Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church of Richmond, Calif., favoring independence for Armenia, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1908. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Rockford and Streator, Ill., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1909. Also, petition of the Boone Post of the American Legion, of Belvidere, Ill., relative to compensation for the widows and orphans of the late war, also the disabled and their dependents, etc.; to the Committee on Way and Means.

1910. Also, petition of the local union of the International Hod Carriers and Building and Common Laborers' Union of America against the Sterling-Graham bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1911. Also, petition of the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association of America, favoring an increase in salary for the personnel of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1912. By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Petition of G. L. Edwards and 27 others, of Cumberland, Iowa, against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1913. By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of City Council of San Jose, Calif., protesting against the sale of the former German merchant fleet; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1914. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Amory, Browne & Co.; Parsons Trading Co.; P. Pastene & Co.; J. H. Williams & Co.; W. E. Aughinbaugh, foreign and export editor New York Commercial; Nafta Co.; Pfister & Vogel Leather Co.; McElwain, Morse & Rogers, all of New York City, favoring the continuation of the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1915. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce relative to certain provisions in the present appropriation bill, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1916. Also, petition of McElwain, Morse & Rogers Co., of New York City, favoring maintenance of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1917. Also, petition of the Ship Construction & Trading Co. (Inc.), of New York, relative to certain legislation that will be introduced; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1918. Also, petition of the Nafta Co., of New York City, in support of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, etc.; also, the Samstag & Hilder Co., supporting the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1919. Also, petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to the Mexican situation, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1920. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of the George A. Morris Post, No. 306, the American Legion, of Paulding, Ohio, favoring House bill 4464; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1921. Also, petitions of the Warren L. McIntire Post, No. 262, the American Legion, of Hamler; the Herbert E. Anderson Post, No. 117, the American Legion, of Defiance; and the Ottawa Post, No. 63, of Ottawa, all in the State of Ohio, relative to all ex-service men and women entitled to bonus of \$50 bond, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1920.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 27, 1920.)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Harding	McKellar	Sherman
Brandegee	Harris	McLean	Simmons
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Owen	Trammell
Elkins	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phelan	Warren
France	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	King	Poin Dexter	Williams
Gay	Kirby	Pomerene	
Gerry	Knox	Ransdell	
Gronna	Lenroot	Reed	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained from the Senate by the death of a member of his family.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained on account of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

As in legislative session,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3037) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer, free of charge, certain surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment to the Department of Agriculture, Post Office Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service, and certain other surplus property to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. MCKENZIE, and Mr. DENT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3076) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COLT. I have a short telegram from the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Woonsocket, R. I., which I should like to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

WOONSOCKET, R. I., February 27.

Hon. L. B. COLT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Copy of resolution adopted by board of directors February 25:

Whereas the progress and the safety of the world demand it; and Whereas in order that the vital interests of the United States and its nationals in Europe may be fully protected and the attention of our Government and our people may be concentrated upon our domestic problems it is essential that the peace treaty be ratified immediately: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Woonsocket hereby urge the President and the Senate to take prompt action with respect to the treaty of peace with Germany, with such reservations as will fully safeguard every fundamental principle of the Government of the United States. Letter follows.

WOONSOCKET CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. NELSON. I have here a short resolution from the American Legion at St. Cloud, Minn., protesting against the \$50 a month bonus. I ask that it may be read. It is very short. It is such a wholesome resolution under present conditions that I think it ought to be noted.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

"Whereas the executive committee of the American Legion, believing that the rank and file of the organization was favorable to a bonus and has therefore suggested that a bond of \$50 be given to each service man and woman for each month of service; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States already is burdened with excessive war debts, causing great public unrest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wallace S. Chute Post, No. 76, of the American Legion, express itself as opposed to the American Legion being put in the position of asking for such bonus, thereby imposing a great burden on the rest of the people of this country at this time; and be it

Resolved further, That we are opposed to the matter of a bonus or adjusted compensation being brought up this year, thus making the ex-service men and women the tools of selfishly ambitious politicians; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to our national headquarters, to our State headquarters, and to our Minnesota member of the national executive committee."

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution from the American Legion Post at St. Cloud, Minn., protesting against the \$50 a month bonus be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Aero Club of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a department of aeronautics, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pomona, Great Bend, Emporia, Park, Tonganoxie, Ford, Montezuma, Buffalo, and Humboldt, all in the State of Kansas, and of College View, Nebr.; Rich Hill, Mo.; and Tacoma, Ohio, remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 331, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, of Atchison, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Sterling-Graham sedition bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Southwestern Millers' League at Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for extensions of credit to encourage foreign trade, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. McLEAN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3958) to amend section 14 of the Federal reserve act, and I submit a report (No. 457) thereon.

I wish to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to consider this bill next Monday, and I hope that every Senator who is interested in the measure will avail himself of the opportunity to read the report of the committee, which contains the reasons assigned by the Federal Reserve Board for this legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ANNIVERSARY OF LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

Mr. HARDING. As chairman of the joint special committee appointed under the provisions of House concurrent resolution 14 to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or any political subdivision thereof and with officers of any organization or societies or with individuals relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, I submit a report accompanied by a joint resolution providing for the appropriation recommended, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Library.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3990) placing Lieut. Col. Charles C. Teare, of the Judge Advocate General's Department, upon the retired list and to retire him with the rank and pay of a lieutenant colonel upon the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 3991) for the relief of Fred E. Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3992) authorizing the exchange of certain lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3993) for the relief of the heirs at law of Jacques Clamorgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3994) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3995) providing for the relinquishment of certain described property by the United States to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT—CONFEREES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is necessarily detained from the Chamber on account of illness. He is one of the conferees on the water-power bill and has asked to be relieved from service upon the conference.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that he may be relieved from further service on the committee of conference, and that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] be appointed in his place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama will be relieved and the appointment of the Senator from Florida will be made accordingly.

MAGNA CHARTA.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on Monday, I believe, I obtained consent of the Senate to have the Magna Charta printed as a public document. I omitted at the time to ask that my remarks in making the request be printed with the document. I now make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

CLAIM OF GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY (H. DOC. NO. 654).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and on motion of Mr. LODGE was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State and accompanying papers in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States based on the action of the authorities of Hudson County, N. J., in holding for their appearance as witnesses in a criminal case in that county, in violation of treaty provisions between the United States and Norway, as the Norwegian Government alleges, three members of the crew of a Norwegian ship called the *Ingrid*, and I recommend that, as an act of grace, and without reference to the question of the liability of the United States, an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of State.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
28 February, 1920.

DISTRICT PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the suggestion and under the authority of the Vice President, the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] as the select committee provided for in Senate resolution 310 to investigate the public-school system of the District of Columbia.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] for a moment while I make some suggestions about his substitute for reservation No. 4.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not reverse its action and adopt this proposed reservation. It not only is opposed to the action of the Senate for four months, but after the treaty has gone into effect as to other nations it is a proposition to amend it as between those nations and make it absolutely impossible for ratification or for the other nations to accept it and admit this country on the terms of the Senator's reservation.

Mr. President, the principal object of adopting reservations instead of amendments, which I voted against from the beginning, was that the reservations should apply to this country alone and might be accepted by the other powers without disturbing the relations between those countries. After that battle has been fought and that principle has been settled the Senator from Nebraska now offers a reservation which amends the treaty not only as to ourselves but as to every party to the treaty.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If it would not interrupt the Senator—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to ask the Senator if the process of accepting an amendment, now that the other signatories are operating under the ratified treaty, so far as they are concerned, does not require the unanimous vote of every Government which has membership on the council and a majority vote of all the other members of the league in order to get the treaty amended?

Mr. KELLOGG. It undoubtedly does, except as to this country, which is not a party.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But I mean if we adopt this alleged reservation, an actual amendment, which, as far as we are con-

cerned, it is, you could not accept it by mere diplomatic notes. It would have to be an amendment of the treaty under the terms of article 26 of the covenant.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator is quite right, and I will come to that point later.

Mr. BORAH. In this connection may I ask a question? By what process did they accept the reservation or amendment which Switzerland put on the other day with reference to reserving her historic policy of neutrality? I read in the press dispatches that the amendment of Switzerland had been accepted by the council of the league.

Mr. KELLOGG. Undoubtedly. I will state to the Senator from Idaho that if it applied to Switzerland alone, as the Senator from Connecticut said, of course they would accept it, but if it applied not only to Switzerland but to all the other countries which had already become parties to the League of Nations and the treaty it could only be amended as provided for by the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; but did the council of the league undertake to assume an acceptance even for the purpose of binding Switzerland?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not know as to that. Undoubtedly it did not have authority, because the other countries would be the ones to determine it.

Mr. BORAH. It occurred to me that it did not have any authority, but it was a fine illustration of what it is going to do without authority.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I may say, if the Senator will permit me, that the press reports stated that the supreme council of the league had accepted it.

Mr. KELLOGG. The reservation proposed by the Senator from Nebraska provides:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council or assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers in international law to be a domestic question.

Therefore, as I said, it would be necessary to amend this league and this treaty as between all the other nations parties to it, and the only possible effect it could have would be absolutely to prevent ratification and destroy the treaty so far as this country is concerned.

I have believed for a long time that it was the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to defeat this treaty, to defeat it with Republican votes if he could, and with Democratic votes if he could not accomplish it any other way.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me that the Senator from Nebraska is not making very much headway in furnishing votes for the business.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I congratulate both Senators upon their new alliance, and while I can not wish them success I wish them all the pleasure they can get out of the alliance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If there is any alliance it is at least in the open; it is not in a secret, nonpartisan, bipartisan compromise, tentative committee.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that so far as the irreconcilables are concerned, if we may call them that, or the "bitter enders," or whatever we may call them, they have made no secret of the fact that they intended to defeat the treaty in any event, if possible; but I will further say that even the Senator from Connecticut rather hesitated to undertake to defeat the treaty now by putting an amendment on it which he knew would mean its certain death.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am in favor of direct action, honestly in the open, Mr. President.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think so. Now, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did not understand. Was a question addressed to me?

Mr. KELLOGG. I was simply congratulating the Senator upon his new alliance; that is all.

Now, Mr. President, as to subdivision 4, if I may have order in the Chamber—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has created a disturbance; we are hunting for new allies.

Mr. KELLOGG. I can not even hear what the Senator says, there are so many Senators who wish to speak.

Mr. BORAH. I said the Senator had created a disturbance; we are hunting for new allies.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator will please wait until I get through before he hunts any more allies.

Now, Mr. President, so far as reservation No. 4 is concerned, if the treaty is to be ratified—and I hope it will be—it is going to be with reservation No. 4, which protects this country as to all its internal policies, its political policies, and domestic questions.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is not the Senator from Minnesota an irreconcilable?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I will let the Senate judge what I am when I get through.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to state an ultimatum.

Mr. KELLOGG. Why, everybody knows that there is not a member of the council or a party to this treaty who would intentionally submit their domestic questions to the decision of any tribunal. So far as I am concerned I have no objection to striking out the word "commerce," but I do not see that it really makes any difference. The council and the league would not have any control and could not decide in arbitration any question as to foreign commerce unless that commerce came under some treaty or rule of international law now existing or existing when the question arose.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator just made a statement—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield for a question, but not for a speech. I want to make a speech myself.

Mr. REED. I wish the Senator would tell us why what he has just stated is true.

Mr. KELLOGG. Because as to whether we shall trade with Argentina, Germany, Australia, or any other country is a question between the particular country and this country, and the league has no jurisdiction over it. If we have a treaty whereby we are granted equal privileges and we are denied them, or we grant equal privileges and then refuse them, that would be a question arising under a treaty and could therefore go to the League of Nations.

Mr. President, for those who are earnestly in favor of the ratification of the treaty the entanglement over the Adriatic question is a rather discouraging feature. I am not going to discuss the merits of the dispute about the boundary between Italy and Austria-Hungary and Serbia. My position is that it is none of our business; that this country ought not to try to settle the boundaries of all of the aspiring nations, new or old, in Europe, which have emerged from the war with some degree of autonomy. I do not think it is our place to do so, and I do not believe the President is justified in attempting to dictate the adjustment between Italy and her neighbors.

Why, Mr. President, it certainly more intimately interests the countries of Europe than it does us; undoubtedly that is true; but the idea that because we took part in the war we are now going to try to dictate the settlement of disputed boundaries and meddle in all the quarrels which follow such a great war as this is unthinkable. If we are going to do this before we have any treaty at all, what will we get into if we do not have an adequate reservation to article 10 after the treaty is signed? I say, therefore, that the Fiume or Adriatic incident does not afford a very encouraging outlook for the smooth operation of the treaty.

Mr. President, I do not know on the face of it why Italy should not protect herself as to her frontier. Austria-Hungary is the ancient enemy of Italy. For generations, yes, for centuries, Italy has lived under the shadow of Austrian and German domination. She went into the war and made great sacrifices. Austria has been defeated, we may say dismembered and humbled, but she may rise again. Why should not Italy protect herself by acquiring the territory inhabited principally on the north by Italians and also protect herself by taking the territory around the head of the Adriatic Sea? Austria's control of that territory has been a menace to the peace of Italy.

I am not going to discuss the Serbs or any other race that inhabits this particular territory, for since the days of the Roman occupation, Roman, Venetian, Italian civilization has had its foothold upon the eastern shores of the Adriatic, and a Roman emperor was born there.

But, Mr. President, let us for a moment consider the ground on which the President undertook to dictate the boundaries between Austria-Hungary and Jugo-Slavia and Italy.

Let me read what the President said in his note of February 24, 1920, to the prime minister of Great Britain and the prime

minister of France. I invite the earnest attention of the Senate to the statement. Mr. Polk, speaking for the President and in the name of the President, said:

He—

The President—

believes it to be the central principle fought for in the war that no Government or group of Governments has the right to dispose of the territory or to determine the political allegiance of any free people. The five great powers, though the Government of the United States constitutes one of them, have in his conviction no more right than had the Austrian Government to dispose of the free Yugoslavic peoples without the free consent and cooperation of those peoples. The President's position is that the powers associated against Germany gave final and irrefutable proof of their sincerity in the war by writing into the treaty of Versailles article 10 of the covenant of the League of Nations, which constitutes an assurance that all the great powers have done what they have compelled Germany to do—have foregone all territorial aggression and all interference with the free political self-determination of the peoples of the world. With this principle lived up to, permanent peace is secured and the supreme object of the recent conflict has been achieved. Justice and self-determination have been substituted for aggression and political dictation.

Mr. President, let us consider for just a moment how far self-determination, which has been applied to prevent the protection and the aspirations of Italy, played a part in the settlement at the peace conference at Versailles. The declaration of self-determination seems to be the central point on which all the other considerations rest in the determination of the Italian question.

What part did self-determination play in the settlement of the Saar Valley question? It played no more part than it did at Versailles in 1871, when Germany demanded and forcibly took from France Alsace and Lorraine. Nobody pretended that self-determination determined the taking from Germany of the Saar Valley. I am not disputing the justice of that action; it was the result of war; it was just retribution, we may say; in fact, I know of no reason why France should not have taken the territory to the Rhine, if it was necessary to protect her. Germany did not hesitate to take French territory in 1871. But to say that the high and altruistic principle of self-determination ruled in the settlement of the Saar Valley question is to say that which is an absurdity.

What part did self-determination play in the Shantung matter? Was China consulted? Were the people consulted whose territory and rights were handed over to Japan? Not at all. What part did self-determination play in the establishment of the modern Serbia? Everyone knows that Bosnia and Herzegovina are simply remaining as a part of the Serbian Government while the shadow of Austrian indemnity is hanging over them, and no longer. What part did it play in the case of Montenegro? Everybody knows that that hardy people, living in their mountain fastnesses, independent for many years, are to-day seething with revolution and rebellion against the control of their country by Serbia. Self-determination had nothing to do with erecting this new nation, which I believe, or fear, is held together by a rope of sand.

I may pause to ask, Are we to pledge ourselves for all time to furnish our manhood, our money, and our resources to maintain those nations which have been erected without regard to the principle of self-determination? I am not saying that they should not have been established, but I am saying that they were parceled out and were not built upon the principle of the self-determination of their people.

Mr. Lloyd-George naïvely asked the President how much did self-determination have to do with the 3,000,000 Russians who were taken into Poland and the 3,000,000 Germans into Czechoslovakia?

Mr. President, I am not inveighing against the establishment of Poland or of a modern Serbia or the other nations which have come out of the storm and the crucible of war. I am saying that self-determination has not been the rule and was not the rule in many cases in the settlements at the Versailles conference. That peace conference, which I believe did honest work as far, perhaps, as it was possible, was actuated by the same motives, the same ambitions, the same hopes and aspirations which have actuated great conferences following other conflicts in history. To say that they were actuated only by the highest motives, and established nations only on the high principles of self-determination and liberty, is to say that which is not true, and I have no doubt it was impossible. You can not surround the peace conference with any such sanctity, nor can self-determination be made the real basis for the settlement of the disputed line between Italy and Austria.

Why, Mr. President, it was the ordinary peace conference. True, this country did not ask anything. We were the most disinterested, and therefore occupied the highest and the most powerful position; and I think we should have said to those nations: "Fix your own boundaries and settle your own dis-

putes. We have helped to vanquish Germany, and we are now willing to withdraw, to act with you in bringing about peace in every way we can, but will not attempt to dictate all of the boundaries and the disputed questions of Europe."

Mr. President, I sometimes think it is a pity that we have not the genius of a Shakespeare to-day to throw around this peace conference the golden halo of romance and lift it from its sordid base. I do not know that they were to blame; but when we attempt to justify all the things that were done as having been along lines of high altruistic motives it can not be done. The members of the conference were human, as we are.

On these grounds I am not opposed to the treaty—not at all. I am not opposed to the League of Nations—not at all. I am in favor of it. I am in favor of taking them both and making the best of them and using our influence to help pull Europe out of the slough of despondency and ruin where the war has placed her, but I do not favor the United States becoming the dictator of Europe. I believe it is therefore all the more important that in the ratification of this treaty—which I hope and believe will be ratified—we should adopt reservations to protect this country in the exercise of all its powers of government and in the settlement and adjustment of all its domestic questions.

I earnestly hope that the reservation offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] will be defeated and that the one adopted by the Senate at the last session of Congress will be again adopted and that upon that principle this treaty will be ratified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	Kirby	Poinexter
Beckham	Hale	Knox	Pomerene
Borah	Harding	Lenroot	Ransdell
Brandeggee	Harris	Lodge	Reed
Capper	Harrison	McKellar	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Henderson	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Elkins	Kendrick	Owen	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Kenyon	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Keyes	Phelan	Watson
Gerry	King	Pittman	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], in making his attack upon the reservation which we have presented as a substitute, has gone far afield to argue matters that have nothing whatever to do with this reservation, and I refer to them only for the purpose of stating very obvious answers to the criticisms which he makes upon the President.

I assume that he is criticizing the President and the representatives of other countries because they turned the Saar Valley over to France for 15 years.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Did not the Senator hear me say that I did not criticize the transaction?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator spoke in such a voice that I lost a part of what he said; but if he was commending the act, then, of course, what I say does not apply. The Saar Valley was turned over to France for 15 years for the stated necessity of giving to France reparation for the damage that Germany had done in destroying the coal mines in the Lens region of France. If Germany had not turned over to France the Saar Valley, with its coal mines, for 15 years it would have been necessary for Germany to make payment in cash or some other means; and it was as much for Germany's benefit as for the benefit of France that the coal mines of the Saar Valley were placed at French disposal for that period of time.

When the Senator intimates that the principle of self-determination was violated in turning over the Saar Valley to France he forgets that at the end of that time a plebiscite is to be taken, and the people of the Saar Valley themselves are to be permitted to decide whether they shall come under the Government of Germany or the Government of France. Thus, instead of the policy and principle of self-determination having been

violated, it was distinctively vindicated in the Saar Valley matter, and it was done very largely through the influence of the President of the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator means, of course, the people who may happen to be in the Saar Valley 15 years from now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course; I mean just that thing, and I so stated.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I can not entirely agree with either Senator. I think the Saar Valley was turned over to France by way of compensation for the coal fields that had been destroyed in France. It was to give France an opportunity to use that coal in place of the coal that had been destroyed in the coal fields of France.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That was exactly my statement, Mr. President.

Mr. KELLOGG. And in answer to that I said in my speech that I entirely approved of it. I should not have objected if they had given the entire Saar Valley to France for all time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; but the Senator was instancing that as a case in which the policy of self-determination was violated, and I am stating to the Senator that that presents a case in which the principle of self-determination was vindicated, because the people of the Saar Valley—a valley which for centuries has been a source of quarrel and dispute between Germany and France—are to be given the first opportunity in their history to decide to which country they shall belong; so that instead of being a source of criticism of the President for abandoning his principle of self-determination, it vindicates that principle.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us what the racial population of the Saar Valley is?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I am not able to state that offhand. It is a mixed population. Probably at the present time it is more German than French.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us whether France has held it since the Napoleonic days?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I think not. I think it is probably as far back as that time.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us how long it was held at that time by France?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, I do not remember that; and I do not care, because it is immaterial to my discussion.

Mr. REED. I only ask because the Senator stated that for centuries the valley had been a source of dispute between the two countries.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have stated that the reason for turning over the Saar Valley to France was one of reparation. France was in a desperate condition for need of coal, and the reason she was in a desperate condition for need of coal was that Germany had very largely destroyed her coal mines in northern France.

It was a matter almost of necessity to recompense France in this way, but the French claim to the Saar Valley, so far as it was a permanent claim, was denied, and it was limited to 15 years; and at the end of that time the people of the Saar Valley were given the right to decide for themselves to which allegiance they should adhere.

The Senator again questions the statement that the principle of self-determination was violated when the nation of Poland was reconstituted, because within the boundaries of that nation so reconstituted there are said to be about 3,000,000 Russians. That presents one of those difficult questions which the council in Paris had to deal with. Everyone knows that when you come to the border lines of those countries races and nationalities intermix, and it is not possible to draw a geographical line which shall be absolutely accurate from ethnological standards. You are bound to include some of two and sometimes of three nationalities within the same area. But Poland was once a nation, and when Russia and Austria and Germany divided Poland among themselves it was a natural thing that Germany as well as Russia should induce and encourage their people to come into what was purely Polish territory.

The same is true of Czechoslovakia, the reconstituted nation of Bohemia. There, also, will be found to-day an element of Germans, but that constitutes no reason why the old nation of Bohemia, which for so many years has been held in subjection,

should not be allowed a resumption of the government of her own people, even when there may be a certain per cent of the foreign element within her borders.

The questions of geography and ethnology were difficult questions for the council to decide, and it comes with poor grace, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], from Senators on the other side of the aisle, who did all they could to destroy the influence of the President of the United States when he was laboring in Paris to maintain the principles of his 14 points, when they sought to destroy his influence in Paris, to charge that he did not entirely succeed in all his altruistic efforts and all his devotion to the ideals which are embodied in the doctrine of the 14 points.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What did you do to uphold the hands of the President in those days? What did you do to strengthen his arms? You stood here in the Senate of the United States and by speeches and by votes did all you could to discredit him and to let the people of Europe believe that he did not represent the public sentiment of the United States; and now you assume to come here and twit him with not having succeeded in all that he undertook to do.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Will the Senator state anything that I did to hamper the President in Paris? Apparently he scorned any assistance from anybody.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will state some things the Senator did. The Senator joined in a conspiracy on that side of the aisle to stuff the Committee on Foreign Relations full of enemies of the treaty, Senators who were pledged to vote to defeat the treaty when it came here.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is one thing the Senator did. The Senator supported that plan, and that was the initiative, it was the beginning, of the effort made here in the Senate to destroy the treaty.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, the Senator knows that that is not true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator from Minnesota has done other things. While always assuming to be a friend of the treaty he has joined his colleagues over there in preventing every effort at compromise. He knows just as well as we know that you have succeeded in producing a solidarity of support for these reservations, a solidarity of support for yielding to the enemies of the treaty on that side of the aisle. How have you succeeded in getting a majority of the Senate to support these reservations? Have you done it by getting the votes of friends of the treaty? I ask the Senator from Minnesota, if he will give me his attention, whether it would have been possible to secure a majority of the Senate for the pending reservations without the votes of the 14 enemies of the treaty and the League of Nations? Will the Senator answer me that question?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not think it would have been possible to get any reservations to protect this country without the entire Republican vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator knows that when he agreed to those reservations under the assertion that he was a friend of the treaty, he voted for the very reservations that the enemies of the treaty supported because they thought it would kill the treaty.

Mr. KNOX. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. Two or three times lately the argument has been made that has just been made by the Senator from Nebraska, that Senators on this side failed to uphold the hands of the President while he was in Paris molding this treaty, and not only failed to uphold his hands but attacked him in the measures which he was trying to put through. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska, with the wires centered in the hands of Mr. Creel and the censorship that could not be overcome, what information did we ever get as to what was to be put into the treaty or what was put into the treaty until the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] procured a copy of it through a newspaper and had it put into the Record here?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There never has been a time in the history of the world when the Senate has been advised in advance what the representatives of the President were doing in their negotiations. The Senator knows very well that the power to negotiate treaties is an Executive power, and I assert that the President had a right as the Executive to go there and make his treaty with the executives of the other nations.

Mr. KNOX. I am not challenging that at all, Mr. President. I recall very distinctly that before the President went upon this mission he took this case outside of the ordinary case and told us that all he would know we should know, and we sat here in expectation for months hoping that we could get some knowledge; but we got none. I am not saying that the President was not within his rights by secretly negotiating the treaty, because as the negotiator he could select any method that he saw fit; but I do not want this side of the Chamber to lie under the unjust accusation that we were attacking the measure which he was trying to put through when we had absolutely no information about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not said that you were attacking the measure. What I said was that you were attacking the President and endeavoring to discredit him in every way and weaken him in the efforts he was making there in Paris; and when now you find here and there a flaw, as you see it, in the treaty, comparing it with his ideals, you are taking advantage of your own wrong. After having done all you could to weaken him, you are trying to point out that he did not succeed in some of the things he aimed to do. That is what I am asserting.

But, Mr. President, this is not very germane to what is now before the Senate. The question before the Senate is the reservation which I have presented, and which I presented last November, known as reservation No. 4. It has been criticized by the statement that it involves an amendment of the treaty, an amendment of the League of Nations. Mr. President, that comes certainly with poor grace from Senators who have been voting for amendments, from Senators who have been supporting reservations, which do change the treaty in vital and essential particulars. It is rather remarkable that they, after a record of that sort, in which they have sought to tear the treaty to pieces and amend the League of Nations and nullify the provisions of the League of Nations, should now charge that I am engaged in that enterprise.

Mr. President, this reservation, which had the support of Senators on this side of the aisle last November and which I hope will have their support now, is an interpretative reservation, and it is such a reservation as we think proper to attach to the treaty. It covers substantially—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Who does the Senator speak of when he says "we"? This proposition has never been approved, so far as I know, by any Democratic conference or Democratic steering committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know that the Senator was present, but early in November a Democratic conference was called and these reservations were read to them, and they agreed to stand by them and they did stand by them, including the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to correct the Senator. I did not stand by them. A motion to direct the Committee of the Whole to report the treaty with certain reservations does not mean that you stand by the reservations, for at the time I cast my vote I called attention to the fact that no one would be bound by the report, but it would come to the Senate with the right to amend the report, and that is entirely true. Voting to bring it again to the Senate from the Committee of the Whole did not mean an indorsement of this reservation, or, rather, this amendment to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am rather surprised that the Senator from Georgia should make that statement. He made that explanation a few days ago, and I called his personal attention to the fact that he not only voted for my motion at that time, including this reservation among others, but that on a previous occasion he voted for this reservation itself as a separate proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not recall that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be glad to enlighten the Senator. On November 15 last I presented in the Senate the following reservation:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or its assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers to be in international law a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matters relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

That is almost identically the same reservation. The only change I made at this time was in striking out the words "international law," which, I think, was an accidental inclusion and which does not change the meaning of the reservation in any respect. On the roll call the yeas were 43 and the nays were 52, and among the Democrats who voted for that reservation I find recorded "SMITH of Georgia."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the language was different; but even were the language the same, the effect will be different. The Senator can laugh, but he is now fighting the

treaty. The language was different and the effect will be entirely different. At that stage of the procedure on the treaty last November it might have been practical to adopt an amendment to the treaty, but at this stage, when we know that no amendment can be put to the treaty, after so many countries have acted, we know it will defeat the treaty, and I think the course of the Senator can only be accounted for upon the ground that he is ready to defeat ratification of the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is welcome to his own conclusion. I think probably the Senate and the country will be able to decide whether I have been for the treaty or against it. There are some Senators you are hardly able to identify as to whether they are for it or against it, but I believe it will be generally agreed that I am for it.

But, Mr. President, this is not an amendment of the treaty. It is an amendment offered to the reservation of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], because it is a substitute. I desire at this time to read my reservation:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers to be a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matter relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

Is there any Senator here who claims that a nation is required to submit to the league, its council or assembly, for decision a matter which is a domestic question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator wish to have me answer?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. Under the League of Nations the question whether a matter is a domestic question or not may be decided by the league, and therefore the league may have jurisdiction over domestic questions. This says "that no member nation is required to submit," and so forth. That would include England, France, Italy, and Japan, who have already ratified the treaty, and would release them absolutely from the obligation of that provision of the League of Nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Any intelligent man knows that the League of Nations is formed for the purpose of dealing with international and not with domestic questions, and any intelligent man knows that no member of the league, the United States or any other, will ever submit to have its domestic questions passed upon by the league.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I never have thought that any reservation on this subject was necessary. I never thought that the league, formed to deal with international questions, would ever attempt to assert its control over domestic questions. The only reason why I ever introduced it, and when I introduced it last November, was in the hope that it might secure the votes of some Senators on the other side of the aisle who have become obsessed with the idea that their reservations are more important than the league itself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Do you mean by this amendment that the council of the league shall still determine what are and what are not domestic questions? Do you mean by this provision—I will not call it an amendment—to take away from the council of the league the right to determine what are and what are not domestic questions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean that no nation is required, just as the language says, to submit to the league or any of its organs the power to pass upon a domestic question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand, but the league covenant provides that the council shall determine in case of a dispute whether it is or is not a domestic question. Article 15 provides that "if the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report." Does the Senator intend by his substitute to change that provision in the league covenant and take away from the council the right to determine what are and what are not domestic questions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the council may report that, but no nation is required to submit to it. That was not necessary. It was put in there because Senators of the United States, when the first draft of the league came over here, stated that there ought to be a reservation on the subject. They stated that it might be interpreted to mean that the league might take jurisdiction over domestic questions, and so this additional paragraph which the Senator has just read was inserted, but it is not exclusive.

That still exists; that is not changed. The council can still do so, but no nation is required to submit to it, and never was required to submit to it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me ask the Senator, Does not the league covenant expressly provide that we will submit all disputes to the council and that the council shall continue to handle them, unless the point is made that a dispute is a domestic question, and then does it not provide that the council will still handle the question, though we claimed that it was a domestic question, unless the council found that it was domestic? So has not the Senator left in the council the privilege of determining what are and what are not domestic questions, or else has he not changed the covenant by his provision?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the claim that this reservation changes the covenant is no stronger than to say that the reservation presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] changes the covenant. The only difference between the two reservations is that the reservation presented by the Senator from Massachusetts asserts a right of the United States, while my reservation asserts that same right but declares it is a right which belongs to all members. If we assert the right as to ourselves the provisions of the covenant are just as much affected as if we said that other nations shall be upon the same basis.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, I want to ask the Senator, does he change, by the proposition which he has offered, the paragraph of article 15 which declares that the council shall exercise control of all controversies unless the council finds that they involve domestic questions? Does the Senator mean that the United States shall determine whether or not a question is domestic, or does he mean that the council is still to determine, under the league, whether a dispute is domestic? Which does the Senator mean?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In the first place, this does not put everything under the control of the council in the broad manner the language of the Senator implies; and, in the second place, I assert that my provision makes less of a change in the league than the reservation presented by the committee, and for this reason: The fundamental principle of the League of Nations is that all members of the league are upon an equal basis; that one is bound just as another is bound. It is provided in the committee reservation that the United States shall be placed in a class by itself; and I judge from what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Kellogg] has said that he avers that we shall be placed in a class by ourselves, that we shall not be bound, but that the other nations shall be bound to submit to a certain thing. That is a violation of the fundamental principle of the League of Nations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Whereas my reservation provides that the right which we claim for ourselves is a right which belongs independently to every other member of the league. The relative positions of the nations are in no wise affected by my reservation, whereas the reservation which Senators on the other side of the aisle are supporting makes a distinct and emphatic difference between the United States and other nations, and that is out of harmony with every principle of the league.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only want to ask the Senator one more question, and then I will quit. Will he tell us whether he means by his substitute to take away from the council the right to determine whether or not a question is domestic or international? Does he mean that we shall determine that for ourselves, or that it shall be left to the council?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean to say that no nation—the United States nor any other nation—shall be compelled to submit to the council a domestic question nor to permit the council to decide what is a domestic question.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the Senator if a dispute comes before the council, and the council determines that it is an international question and not a domestic question, does the council have jurisdiction of the dispute?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Under this reservation—

Mr. LENROOT. I mean under the treaty as it stands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Under the treaty as it stands the council has power to act, but I have no doubt that the nations need not recognize the act.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well. Then what becomes of the agreement that where the council has power to act and acts unanimously the nation does bind itself to stand by the award?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator, I am sure, in his fair moments will not claim that the nine members constituting the council are going to establish a principle which will enable the council at some time to go into their domestic affairs. It was never intended that the league should mix in domestic affairs, and I do not think even the Senator from Wisconsin will say that the council would ever undertake to usurp functions that were not properly intended it should exercise.

Mr. LENROOT. No; but supposing one of the parties to the dispute makes the claim that it is not domestic but international, who is to decide the dispute under the treaty as it stands?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it would not be a dispute.

Mr. LENROOT. Why not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The nation would have the right to say: "That is a domestic question, and not for the consideration of the league."

Mr. LENROOT. But one party to the dispute claims it is not a domestic question. Who then decides?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Nobody. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Then what was the purpose of the treaty in providing that, if the council finds that the question is a domestic one, it shall not take jurisdiction?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It provides that it shall not take jurisdiction in that event; it does not provide that it shall.

Mr. LENROOT. It says that in that kind of a case it shall not make a report; and the Senator from Nebraska, although he may not be a lawyer, well knows that where they are denied the power to make a report in a given case, it implies the power to make it where that condition does not exist; and then we have bound ourselves to abide by the decision.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I disagree with the Senator entirely. It is simply a limitation on the powers of the council, and the reservation which is presented from the Republican side of the Senate proposes an additional limitation that makes it apply only to the United States. Now, I say it is a violation of the very principle of the league to give something to the United States which we are not willing to accord to all members of the league. My reservation is framed on the line of interpreting the treaty to mean, as I believe it does mean, that no nation shall ever be required to submit its domestic questions to the decision of the league.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator what, in his mind, is the difference between a reservation and an amendment? I am sure it will be interesting to the Senate to know.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I observe the Senator from Wisconsin and a number of other Senators on the other side of the Chamber are very anxious to probe into the workings of my mind on these questions; but I have stated before that I am not disposed to split hairs with them on these subjects. There has been entirely too much of hairsplitting since we began the consideration of this great document; there has been too little disposition to accept its principles and to accept its objects and entirely too much disposition to split hairs on the fine meaning of words, on the theory that we were entering into a contract with a lot of bandits and were likely to lose our rights.

Now, what are the facts, Mr. President? The facts are that in common with the other democracies of the world we are undertaking to enter into an agreement to preserve the peace of the world. We ought to enter as equals, one being bound no more than the other is bound. We are not dealing with the murderous and criminal element of the world; we are dealing with the great democracies of the world that are governed by public opinion; and those democracies have an interest, as we have, in agreeing to do those things which will work for peace and agreeing not to do those things which will produce war; and yet we have spent nearly a year here in considering reservations on the theory that we were dealing with a lot of criminals and cutthroats and confidence men. Can not we, the greatest Nation in the world, enter into a compact with the remainder of the world to preserve its peace without haggling over reservations supposed to be in the interest of protecting our rights?

What reservation has been offered on the other side of the aisle designed to strengthen the league, designed to improve its efficiency, designed to preserve the peace of the world, designed to reduce the armaments of the world, designed to do justice to the subject peoples of the world? Those which have been offered are all petty, hairsplitting reservations, written on the theory that we are an innocent lamb about to go into a menagerie of wild animals and that we have to protect ourselves.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Nebraska thinks it is very unfair for some of us to ask him to disclose what is in his mind on these important subjects; but I wish to ask the Senator, when he asserts that our reservations are amendments, is it not fair and is it not due to the Senate that he explain what in his mind is the difference between a reservation and an amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. An amendment is something which destroys the very purpose and spirit of the league, and such an amendment is found in the reservation to article 10. I will give the Senator an illustration.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator does that, if he will yield further, I rather thought that was the Senator's idea of what an amendment was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that is my idea.

Mr. LENROOT. But nobody else agrees with the Senator from Nebraska as to that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, I deny that conclusion of the Senator; but it is immaterial whether they do or not; the fact is that as to article 10, which is an agreement that all members of the league shall respect the territorial integrity and political independence of all other nations, members of the league, and preserve them against outside aggression, you write a direct repudiation of that obligation into a reservation; you repudiate in the strongest language any obligation to do that thing, and you call it a reservation.

Mr. LENROOT. How can we repudiate something until we have assumed it? The reservation referred to merely declines to assume the obligation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is an amendment; that is what I say; that is what I am claiming, that the Senator is endeavoring to change the league, and he is not only endeavoring to amend the league in one of its most important covenants, but he proposes to have the United States stand out by itself and say to the remainder of the world, "You are bound to preserve as well as respect the territorial integrity and political independence of the other members of the league, but we are not bound; you are bound to do that thing, but we are not; you assume the burden, but we do not." That is the position of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator what rights, duties, or obligations of any other member of the league are affected by these reservations, and what rights, duties, and obligations are affected by his substitute? Then we will get the difference.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have just stated to the Senator that the President of the United States went over there and negotiated a treaty that led to the formulation of a covenant for a great league of all the democracies of the world, designed to preserve peace. The nations were to come in as equals; they were to be equally obligated to do certain things, one no more than another. He brings it over here and the Senator from Wisconsin, while sometime described as a "mild reservationist," becomes the strongest advocate, perhaps, of a reservation which absolutely repudiates and refuses to accept an obligation which the other nations of the world not only agreed to accept but which they have ratified. He takes the position that we should now enter the league relieved from the obligation which the nations that fought the war with us, and which with us are obligated to maintain the peace of the world, have assumed. I say such a reservation is misnamed; it is an amendment; that is the reason that the Senator from Idaho and his colleagues, as they frankly avow, support these reservations; that is the reason the Senator from Connecticut supports these reservations; they go to kill the league, and that is what those Senators want to do. They are frank; they are fair; they are candid; but those Senators who, like the Senator from Wisconsin, support these destructive reservations on the theory that the league will still live, are either very much misguided or something worse.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not the Senator's difficulty that he assumes that the President of the United States in negotiating this treaty bound the United States? Of course, he did no such thing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; that is not my difficulty. The President exercised a constitutional authority. You can reject the league; you can reject the treaty, if you have the votes to do

so, but when, under the pretense of making a reservation, you destroy our participation in it, you have done a contemptible thing; you have entered a league in which we are to have the benefits but only a part of the burdens.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly tell us what benefits we are to get out of this league? I should like to have a bill of particulars right now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In the first place I know of no country more interested in preserving the peace of the world than the United States; I know of no country where the sentiment against militarism is stronger than in the United States. If the league covenant goes into effect, the peace of the world is going to be preserved. The United States is enormously interested in Europe—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will ask the Senator not to interrupt me until I finish my answer. The United States sells most of its surplus products to Europe. Aside from any sentimental reason, Europe when facing destruction, Europe whose civilization has been actually in danger by this war, is a field in which we have deep interest. If we in the United States look over to Europe in times of prosperity and peace, we look upon the part of the world that is our greatest customer. Europe buys our surplus farm products, Europe buys the products of our mines, and Europe has begun to purchase in a large degree the products also of our factories. Now, if civilization is to go to wreck in Europe and by constant wars Europe sinks, as it may, to the state of Asia, we lose our greatest customer. So, aside from any altruistic reasons, aside from any ideals, the United States is interested not only in restoring peace to Europe for material reasons, but in keeping the peace in Europe.

Again, in this war, in which the United States has accumulated a debt of \$26,000,000,000, she has incurred also the enmity of a large part of the people of Europe, and, if no device of civilization is formed to preserve the peace in the future, the United States must necessarily prepare to defend herself some day from the people whose enmity we have incurred—not only Europe but Japan.

There seems to have been a perfect madness on the part of Senators in this Chamber to offend and antagonize every nation in the world. Japan has been denounced in the most bitter and extreme terms, and Japan has been given to understand that the people of the United States view her with enmity. We have heard speeches here in this Chamber in denunciation of Great Britain and in criticism of France and in denunciation of all the peoples of the world, even those that have been associated with us. So I say, Mr. President, that if we are not ready to go into the league to help the world to maintain peace, we must prepare for war.

When the Senator from Missouri asks me what benefit we get out of it, I ask him, What benefit would we have had out of it if the league could have been established 10 years ago, before this war began? We would have escaped the expenditure of thousands of millions of dollars and the loss of fifty or sixty thousand men dead upon the fields of France and Flanders. The United States has much to gain by an arrangement of this kind.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, since the Senator asks me—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not asking the Senator anything. We have much to gain by entering into an agreement to maintain the peace of the world. The United States is the greatest nation in the world—the greatest in commerce, the greatest in wealth, the greatest in credit-giving power, the greatest in population—and the United States is interested in the peace of the world; and when the Senator asks me what benefit we have to derive from it, I say there are many benefits—much more than ideals—that we can derive if we can devise a plan to maintain the peace of the world.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator says that we are interested in the peace of the world. We are; but he then asserts that this League of Nations will give us that peace. There is the bone of contention. He assumes that it will; we assume that it will not; and when his assertion that it will give us peace is taken out of his syllogism there is nothing left.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yielded for a question. I hope the Senator will not make a speech in my time.

Mr. REED. The Senator did not say that he yielded merely for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator can take his own time to reply. I want to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. REED. Just let me say this, and I shall be very brief about it:

The Senator's main argument—and I just want to get that clear—is that we have incurred the enmity of all of Europe through this war, and that if we do not have the League of Nations all of Europe will come over here and conquer us.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, I did not say that.

Mr. REED. I think that was a fair construction of what the Senator said. If he did not mean that, then I think he will have to revise his remarks. Does the Senator think that, if we enter into a combination with our enemies, that will make them our friends—that we will be safe with men inside the house who are ready to attack us from the outside?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have not said what the Senator attributes to me. I have said that the time has come in the world's history when it is governed by democracies; that if by forming the league at this time we can maintain the results of the war, the world will remain in the hands of democracies; and these democracies, governed by public opinion, are entirely capable of making a contract with each other not to do the things that work for war and to do the things that work for peace.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? He says the world is governed by democracies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I said so.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think that Japan is a democracy?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is rapidly becoming a democracy.

Mr. REED. Oh, I may be rapidly becoming an angel, but I have not yet arrived at that stage.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I know whereof I speak when I say that Japan is rapidly becoming a democracy. The change that has come over the world represents the passage of the world from one stage to another. We are entering into a new era, just as much as the world entered into a new era when the Dark Ages passed away.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I decline to yield now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is just simply a question whether the United States is going to do its part in reorganizing the world for peace as it has always been organized for war. Heretofore the world has been organized for war. Every nation has used probably more than one-half of the revenues of its government for destructive purposes; and possibly there was no way to put an end to that condition until the fall of the German Empire and the Russian autocracy and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, all of which were bent on conquest; but that time has passed away. Great Britain is a democracy. Her Government responds more immediately to public opinion than the Government of the United States. Her cabinets rise and fall as the public opinion of Great Britain changes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I decline to yield.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. France has become a republic, and her government is in the hands of her people. Italy is a limited monarchy, ruled by a cabinet, not by a king, and that cabinet comes and goes in accordance with the public opinion of the people of Italy. The same is true of Spain. The same is true of Holland. The same is true of Belgium. The same is true of the Scandinavian countries to the north, and it is going to be true of Russia. Russia is going through the welter and the strife of a revolution, just as France did, and Russia will emerge into a republic, just as France emerged.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there? If Russia is emerging into a republic, will the Senator tell us why the fathers of the League of Nations sent their armies in on that republic?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will not insist on interrupting me when I have asked him not to do so.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have been good-natured in yielding to questions.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. NEW. Is it required of the members of the cabinet in these foreign nations that they shall have minds that track with that of the monarch?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I regret that the Senator from Indiana is not disposed to take seriously what I say. I am trying to make an argument to the effect that the world is now controlled by democracies, and that those democracies are controlled by

public opinion; that Russia, which was an autocracy, is developing into a republic; that Germany has already become a republic; that in all those countries hereafter the power for war and for peace, instead of being in the control of a handful of men, is going to be in the control of the people; and that we can safely make a contract with those democracies, governed by those people, when we perhaps could not have safely made such a contract in the days when conquering empires ruled the world.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COLT. I understood the Senator to say that he thought it was dishonorable for the United States not to accept this covenant as it stands. This covenant comprises, I think, 26 articles. Is it not the duty of the Senate of the United States, as a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power, to examine into these articles, to see what they mean, and how far the interests of the United States are affected thereby? And if, upon examination and discussion, it should be found that one of those articles, in the opinion of the Senate, is detrimental to the United States, is there anything dishonorable in the United States saying that it refuses to be bound by that article, and that it excepts itself from that particular provision?

I should like to ask the Senator, further, if it is not the common practice, where a treaty embraces numerous articles, and where there are numerous contracting parties, for one of the parties to say that it will not be bound by a particular article or articles, and thereby make a conditional ratification, asking the other members if they choose to admit it into the contract upon the conditions which it imposes?

There can not be anything dishonorable, can there, for the Senate of the United States, in a treaty of this magnitude which was negotiated by the President, upon full review and consideration, to say that the United States ought not to be bound by some of the provisions of the treaty? Would the Senator's position be that we must practically take this covenant as it stands, and that we should not, under the circumstances, except ourselves from any of the articles? I do not take that view.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator has to some extent misunderstood me. I did not say it would be dishonorable for the United States to express dissent from a certain article. What I said was that it would be dishonorable for the United States, as the greatest and most powerful Nation of the world, to go into a league with other nations to do a certain thing, and then shirk our share of it. It is just the same as if the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut and I should sit down at a table and draw up articles of agreement under which we united to do a certain thing for the good of the community and for our mutual good, and then, when the three—the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut—had signed the agreement, if I should lean back and say, "Well, I am going to sign this on a little different basis. I am going to provide that I will not agree to do that which you have already agreed to do. I am going to release myself." I say that in a case of that kind I would be doing a dishonorable thing. I say that I would be a shirker in the great work of redeeming the world. I say that I would be putting upon the other nations of civilization the burden of maintaining the peace of the world, and running away from my duty myself. That is what I call dishonorable.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, the Senator is using general phrases. When France excepted herself from certain articles in the slave-trade treaty it was not regarded as dishonorable on her part; and, of course, if she took herself out from certain articles she took herself out from the responsibility of those articles. I maintain that it is not dishonorable for the United States to take herself out from any article in this covenant if she thinks, under the circumstances, it is proper for her to do so, leaving the other nations the right to pursue the same course or not, as they please. The principle is what I am contending for.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Carrying out the simile that I have used here, if I was not ready to assume an equal obligation with the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut I had better stay out of the league altogether and not get the benefits of it; and so I am in favor of the United States staying out of the league unless it is ready to go in as an equal and assume equal obligations with other members of the league.

Mr. COLT. That involves the proposition that the United States must take the league just as it stands. It involves the

proposition that where a treaty is made between numerous parties involving many articles it is dishonorable for any one of the parties to take itself out from a certain article, thereby relieving itself from the responsibility of that article. No such principle exists with regard to treaty making. No principle exists permitting the President to negotiate a treaty and then throw upon the Senate the burden of ratifying that treaty as it stands. The effect of such a practice would be to relieve the Senate of all responsibility as a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power.

I maintain that in this great treaty, which calls for a certain departure on the part of America from its traditional policy, the Senate has a bounden duty to examine every article, and if we reach the conclusion that the United States should not be bound by that article it is our duty to take ourselves out from that article; and such a procedure is not dishonorable. This is the common practice that is pursued in every treaty embracing numerous articles and having numerous signatories.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, like the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], I have gone far afield. The question before the Senate is this reservation:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or its assembly for decision, report, or recommendation any matter which it considers to be a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matter relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

That reservation is clear and specific and no man can claim that under it the United States is in any possible peril. The only difference between it and the reservation presented on the other side is that this reservation of mine leaves the United States an equal with the other nations. It claims no rights exclusively for the United States, but accords to the others the same rights which we claim for ourselves over our domestic matters.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] made an accurate statement in the closing part of his remarks when he stated that he had traveled far afield and discussed a good many questions which were not strictly relevant to his amendment. But the Senator has not seemed to me from the beginning either to have had a clear conception of the difference between an amendment and a reservation, or if he has, he has not been able to convey his idea of the distinction between them to me. I prefer to think that he has not a clear conception of the fundamental difference between the two things, because I do not charge him with any lack of sincerity or any incapacity in the use of the English language.

The Senator in a somewhat inconsistent way charges us with having voted for some amendments to the treaty, and then, congratulating himself upon his present attitude, he offers an amendment to it himself. I voted for every amendment that the Committee on Foreign Relations recommended to this body, but the majority of the Senate at that time, led by the valiant and chivalric Senator from Nebraska, slaughtered them on the ground that they would defeat the treaty, that it would necessitate resubmission to the peace conference and reconvening the peace conference, although the peace conference sat there perfectly tranquil in Paris ready to receive and deal with anything that came before it at the time.

Now, however, it must be obvious to anybody, it seems to me, who wants to look at the question in its true aspect, that all the other signatory nations having ratified the treaty as it was written textually, having entered into the execution of the treaty and now operating under it in its original form, for us to offer a change in the text of the treaty making a change in the duties of all the parties who signed the contract, and are now in the performance of it, without their knowledge or consent, as well as a change in our own duties in respect to the treaty, of course it is, as the lawyers say, irrelevant and impertinent, not to say impossible and foolish.

This is the difference, if I am able to understand it, between an amendment and a reservation to the treaty. An amendment changes the text of the instrument as it was submitted to us. I suppose that statement is intelligible. Changing the text means striking some words out of it or inserting some additional words into it, or both. No reservation that the Senate has adopted to the treaty does any such thing. We realize that we can not change the text of the treaty now because as to other parties it is all accepted and in operation, and they have plainly said so. They have ratified it and approved it as it stands. We do not approve it as it stands and by reservations we say that the United States in ratifying the treaty understands that it shall not be bound to do certain things, or that it understands that the treaty in using certain words shall, so far as we are concerned, be construed to mean such and such a thing. That is, any reservation which we adopt, we adopt in our own proper right and authority, as we have a perfect right, and there are

innumerable precedents for so doing. We are not meddling with the affairs of the other nations. We are defining our own duties if we ratify this thing and if the other powers are willing to receive our instrument of ratification without protest. We are saying: "We are willing to form this limited partnership with you if you want to have it on that basis. It is entirely optional and voluntary with you. If you do not like our construction of certain parts of the treaty, if you do not like the reservations of understandings that we have adopted as defining our own responsibility, you need not have us for a partner. We do not attempt to influence you; we do not attempt to tell you what you ought to have said was your duty to each other, and which you have said by ratifying the treaty. That is none of our business; but it is our business, and our exclusive business, to say what contract we will make with you; and it is your exclusive business to say whether you want us to make that contract with you or not. We make open profert and tender before the whole world of our understanding of a paper negotiated by the constitutional authority of this country, the President, to negotiate a proposition and present it to his constitutional and equal partner, the Senate, for its approval." We tender that paper with our conditions affixed, made in accordance with the Constitution of the United States in the performance of our constitutional duty thereunder; and if the powers want to say to us, "That is perfectly satisfactory to us," how in the world does it lie in the mouth of either the Senator from Nebraska or any other American citizen to stand here in the American Senate and charge us with being dishonest?

So overwrought and to such high tension of blood pressure do some superheated temperaments become when they throw off all restraint, both physical and intellectual, in their ravings about this chimerical instrument of world power that I am not astounded at any charge that they make. Their sublimated imaginations have run along with, so to speak, the minds of Don Quixote and the faithful Sancho Panza so long that they think the new order of things, the special dispensation of which they have just enjoyed, is already in operation, and that certain of them have attained a new state of holiness and sanctification which utterly removes their immaculate presence from the contact of viler things, and that they have liberty to fulminate, belch fire, denounce, and hurl their anathemas upon the unregenerate even before they see this thing more or less through a glass darkly and without ultimate vision. Heretofore no restraint has been able to control their imaginings and vaporings.

But, Mr. President, the earth is still on its axis and inclined at the regular angle to the ecliptic and is spinning around the sun at the usual rate in spite of the covenant of the league, though I do not doubt that in its operation the covenant of the league will make certain unexpected changes in our daily lives if we become a party to it.

There is one thing that makes a doubting Thomas sometimes sit up and pinch himself and see if he is awake, and that is to see how the original embryo, and what might be called the model upon which the thing has been founded, is now "demonstrating" in actual operation. They have the league over there, and our allies and associates, Great Britain, France, and Italy, have a little difference of opinion with Jugo-Slavia about a little place called Fiume. The league, in its omniscience, is now fulminating. It is operating, not through its apprentices or its dummies or its hired men, whose minds run along with the people who appoint them, but it is operating through the master minds themselves. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning for three pages is filled with an account of the sweet harmony which is now existing between Mr. Lloyd-George and M. Millerand and the President as to the treachery with which they have dealt with each other in repudiating their most solemn agreements which they had jointly entered into.

Mind you, this is just in starting the sacred league that is to insure tranquillity and harmony and justice all over the universe. Before they have opened Pandora's box, right on the inside of the box, these gentlemen are accusing each other of bad faith and are using language that really hurts my feelings.

The President has frequently advised us—I will omit the preamble—that a "new day having dawned," no longer do these wicked nations view each other with suspicion, and so forth, but have all engaged in a mission of service to pure philanthropy, and are desirous of exhibiting their lofty ideals to each other when nobody is looking; that they are simply engaged in altruistic enterprises, not mentioning Egypt or Persia or Syria, or anything on the side that they got away with and openly "arrived at." The President, in rebuking these people who have not attained to the proper state of holiness and sanctity, says:

It is a time to speak with utmost frankness. The Adriatic issue as it now presents itself raises the fundamental question as to whether the American Government—

That is "him" [laughter]—

can on any terms cooperate with its European associates in the great work of maintaining the peace of the world by removing the primary causes of war.

My God! That is what they get first. They wheezed two or three times when they received that. Then the President went on, lest they should forget, and said:

The President—

I say the President went on. This is signed by a gentleman who spells his name L-a-n-s-i-n-g. He wrote the letter—

The President desires to say that if it does not appear feasible to secure acceptance of the just and generous concessions offered by the British, French, and American Governments to Italy in the joint memorandum of those powers of December 9, 1919, which the President has already clearly stated to be the maximum concession—

Not the obtaining of justice, but the maximum "concession"—that the Government of the United States can offer, the President desires to say that he must take under serious consideration the withdrawal of the treaty with Germany and the agreement between the United States and France of June 28, 1919, which are now before the Senate, and permitting the terms of the European settlement to be independently established and enforced by the associated Governments.

You notice the word "allied" has been dropped therefrom. Just think of that!

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. There is a suggestion there of the immediate withdrawal of the treaty, which of course can be done now. But assume that the Senate had approved the treaty and it had been delivered, he could not then get it out as it is now proposed, by stopping it. We would have to stay in for at least two years, would we not?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes.

Mr. REED. It is well enough to remark in passing that the Senate has left the President in a happy position where he can withdraw it up to the present time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We would only be eligible to withdraw, then, if we had performed all our duties under the covenant and all our international duties of every kind.

Mr. REED. To the satisfaction and approval and with the unanimous vote of all of the members of the league.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what it would be but for what the Senator from Nebraska is pleased to designate as our "destructive" reservation. These elements of destruction that offend the Senator from Nebraska are what the Senate considers to be necessary to protect this country and its constitutional institutions from utter destruction and this country from denationalization; and they are said to be "destructive."

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, there has been some discussion by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] with reference to the great benefits the United States would obtain under the treaty. Would the Senator from Connecticut consider those benefits to be of incalculable value if they were all to be thrown away on account of a few Italians on the Adriatic coast?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The President, of course, has stated from the beginning in his intense desire to have us ratify the covenants of the league and the treaty that the heart of the world would be broken if we did not do it; that Europe would lapse into chaos; that it was our plan duty and our Christian moral obligation to enter this thing; that we ought not to suspect anybody of ulterior motives, but that we ought to take the lead in the chivalrous mission to maintain the spiritual leadership of the universe, to jump right into this thing and take the league and hurrah for a new revelation, a human nature newly sanctified and rid of all its mundane attributes; and now at the very first intimation of a difference of opinion between him and the very gentlemen with whom he sat for six months in a dark closet in Paris, demonstrating the virtue of open diplomacy openly arrived at, he denounces them and says the league can go hang for all of him, that the heart of the world can break into its different valves and lobes and pulsate for themselves, because he can not have his way about some little thing that on the map of Europe would look about like the dot of a red pencil on it; the whole business is to be wrenched apart and he will withdraw the thing, and they can not only establish their own order but they can enforce it themselves at their own expense.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator referred to the place where the makers of the treaty sat as a dark closet, which I think describes it very accurately.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. En camera, I think the French is.

Mr. LODGE. I only call attention to the fact that Mr. Keynes, in his book, which most of us have read, the *Economic Consequences of the Peace*, speaks of finding them in a small and overheated room.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There was another one there into which they withdrew on proper occasions.

Mr. LODGE. It is highly probable.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator while cataloguing the evils which would result if we withdrew from the league, that the heart of the world is to be broken if we do not have our way about Fiume, that the civilization of Europe is to be wrecked, forgot to name the more important thing from my viewpoint, just mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. He told us that all the European countries are now at enmity with us and that they are likely to come over here to conquer us, and we might as well prepare for war if we do not adopt the covenant of the League of Nations. So it appears that we are about to plunge ourselves into a great and destructive war with all the world, according to the Senator from Nebraska, over the right of some Italians in a city on the Adriatic, a city which most of us never heard of until it came up in the treaty. I hope the Senator will not overlook that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I do not overlook it. That is what we would be about to-day if we had put our foot into the trap. But we have not done so yet. If we do not put our foot into the trap, if we are liable to get into war with the rest of the world which wants to drag us in, at least I shall console myself with the consciousness that I am fighting under my own flag and for my own country and for something that I know something about!

I venture to say that the American people, for whom this Government is supposed to act, whether it represents them or not, are absolutely ignorant about the technical issues that are contained in the first four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-day, embracing the state papers interchanged between the President and the British and French premiers on the Fiume-Italian question. When the President tells them that it is the attitude of America that this, that, or the other shall be done, and that it is a fundamental and indisputable sine qua non of any participation of this Nation in the affairs of Europe that they should take his view of it, why, he is simply saying what he thinks personally.

There is no way of ascertaining what the views of America are on that question at all. Nobody here on the floor of the Senate, although we are pretty intimately associated, knows what the Senate itself would say if that question were submitted to it as an independent, unprejudiced tribunal to arbitrate the question. There is nobody who has the slightest idea what the United States Senate would say about that question or as to what was just and right. Here a voice issues from America, is heard in London and Paris and Rome, asserting all sorts of things with the greatest assurance, not to say cocksureness, as to what America thinks about this controversy. I have no doubt that, inasmuch as there are many millions of Italians and Jugo-Slavs in this country, America may be viewing this question with mixed emotions; at least, I think the ballot box would be somewhat mixed on it if anybody were running on the issue in one of our big metropolitan cities.

That is the sort of thing that is going on. I shall not quote at length from the State papers, but on page 3551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1920, is the reply, signed Millerand, D. Lloyd-George, and Davis, to the President under date of London, February 17, 1920, which reads, in part, as follows:

The Governments of France and Great Britain, therefore, view with consternation the threat of the United States Government to withdraw from the comity of nations because it does not agree with the precise terms of the Adriatic settlement. The difficulty of reconciling ethnographic with other considerations is certainly not greater in the Adriatic case and does not produce more anomalous results than in the case of other parts of the general treaties of peace difficulties which were recognized by President Wilson and his colleagues where they agreed to the best settlement practicable at the time because their machinery for peaceful readjustment had come into being; also ethnologic reasons can not be the only ones to be taken into account is clearly shown by the inclusion of 3,000,000 Germans in Czechoslovakia and the proposals so actively supported by the United States delegation for the inclusion within Poland of great Ruthenian majorities, exceeding 3,500,000 in number, to Polish rule. Though the British representatives saw serious objections to this arrangement, the British Government have not thought themselves justified in reconsidering on that account their membership in the League of Nations. The Governments of France and Great Britain, therefore, earnestly trust that whatever the final view of the United States Government as to the Adriatic settlement may be, they will not wreck the whole machinery for dealing with international disputes by withdrawing from the treaties of 1919 because their view is not adopted in this particular case. That would be to destroy the hopes now entertained by countless millions of people all over the world that the most enduring and most beneficent part of the treaty of peace was the constitution of machinery whereby the defects of treaties could be remedied, and that changing conditions and requirements of mankind could be adjusted by processes of reason and justice instead of by the balancing of armaments and resort to war. The Governments of France and Great Britain can not believe that it is the

purpose of the American people to take a step so far-reaching and terrible in its effects on a ground which has the appearance of being so inadequate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know how the Senator from Connecticut views that statement on the part of the premiers of France and England wherein they seem to place so much confidence in this league. To my mind it is a very remarkable exhibition of insincerity upon the part of both of them. It is a matter of history that neither Lloyd-George nor Clemenceau nor Millerand have ever had any confidence in the league and over and over again have expressed themselves to that effect, privately and semipublicly. I simply call the Senator's attention to the manner in which propaganda is being constantly put out by those in Europe who want to accomplish certain purposes and undertake to accomplish them by eulogizing the league because they think the American people believe in it. The statesmen referred to do not believe in the league; they never have believed in it. They were unwilling to accept it as a guaranty of peace in Europe; they were unwilling to go into the league until certain prerequisite conditions were fulfilled which, to their mind, made it more safe for them. I do not, therefore, accept the statement of those gentlemen as being made with any degree of sincerity whatever.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I think I take the same view of that subject as does the Senator from Idaho. I had not commented on the language which I read. The Senator took the proper occasion immediately upon its quotation to call attention to his view about it.

Of course, when these gentlemen say to Mr. Wilson that they can not believe that the American people will "wreck the whole machinery for dealing with international disputes," and so forth, they are using the lingo of Mr. Wilson to him; they are appealing to him in the well-known vernacular in which he appealed to them. It is the kind of talk that is prevalent upon this subject. Everything is going to wreck unless the league and the covenant go through.

Mr. THOMAS. It is diplomatic reciprocity.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is diplomatic reciprocity, or comity that exists between comrades, "hands across the sea." [Laughter.] They understand it all right; but this is a public document and it must keep up the superheated temperature of the crusade. It was a crusade, and the crusaders, having learned the international volapuk by which they communicate their spiritual emotions to each other, find it difficult to discard it now.

But, Mr. President, the world did get along for I do not know how many hundred thousand or millions of years without any league, and some of us thought we had arrived at quite a stage of civilization. At any rate, we have become advanced and intelligent enough in this country to establish a Government of constitutional guaranties; a Government by which the people, through their representatives, could carry out their will; a Government in which law and order and life and property were fairly well secured; a society in which every man, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, can act with equal force and effect at the ballot box; a Government in which whatever revolution existed consisted of simply "turning the rascals out" and putting the honest victors in their places until they in turn were subjected to a similar fate; but there was no blood letting or throat cutting about it. However, that evidently is no longer sufficient, and that Government of free men, which our fathers established in a bloody revolution against one of the very gentlemen with whom we are now interchanging this uplift talk, is now to merge itself, according to this league and covenant, in a super-government, and all these things that are embarrassing to any nation in the world are hereafter to be cared for by this super-government in the manner indicated by the judicial temperament which is manifested by these great world-powering statesmen, who have filled four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning with an interchange of drolleries.

There may be Americans who think "that is a consummation devoutly to be wished." As I have said from the beginning, this treaty and its constitution for a League of Nations—it was somewhat imprudently, although more correctly, named in its first edition as a "constitution for a new world order of things"—that constitution for a new world order, now called a covenant for a League of Nations, with what will be established in it and what it will acquire by its rotary movement in operation, like a snowball rolling down hill in a wet snow, with its permanent secretariat, now so beautifully filled by a British

duke, and all its minor positions occupied by foreigners, in continuous operation, with its hordes of paid emissaries, inspectors, and trouble makers of various kinds, will constitute a new and hitherto undreamed of political unit of power in the world; and that is what it is intended to do.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes.

Mr. REED. In that connection I should like to call the Senator's attention to the London Times of February 11, quoting Lord Curzon, as follows:

And I believe most profoundly that in the seriousness in which the council of the league approaches the problems before us, in the authority which it acquires—and everybody ought to lend a hand to magnify that authority—and in the spirit which characterizes its debates and its action will be the one real hope, not of Europe alone but of the world, that we are to advance into a new era.

I call attention particularly to the expression "and everybody ought to lend a hand to magnify that authority." So that already, before this league is formed, at least before we are a responsible party to it, the proposition is to "magnify its authority," and that coming from a responsible British statesman.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes, Mr. President; I thank the Senator. The more people dream about this covenant and this league and the functions which it is to exercise the more it ought to repel free American citizens who have been brought up upon the doctrine of home rule and minding their own business and avoiding entangling alliances and the more should it incline them to keep out of this thing.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. While the Senator is discussing the official correspondence between our Government and the representatives of Great Britain and France, as printed in the Record, I should like to ask him his idea as to what the authority of these representatives is? In what capacity are they acting in the settlement of this particular dispute in Italy? As I understand, the League of Nations, under the treaty, has been actually put in force, but it is not the League of Nations that is functioning in this instance. Who gives to the representatives of Great Britain and France, and now the President in connection with them, the authority to settle this particular dispute? And if they settle this dispute between Jugo-Slavia and Italy without anybody selecting them, without having been selected by those Governments to settle it, why can they not be self-appointed arbitrators to settle any other dispute between any other nations? When are they going to cease and let the League of Nations, that has already been organized, get into operation and function?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, Mr. President, we get no information at all from the State Department or the White House about any of these matters, so that in answering the Senator's question I am left to my own guesses, so to speak, as to what is going on and why. I assume that the peace conference which framed the German treaty is *functus officio*; I do not know, but I assume so from the fact that the treaty has gone into operation among the European powers, and I suppose that the peace commissioners, so far as their duties in regard to the German treaty are concerned, are out of office, although I do not know, because I have no word of the President resigning to himself or disbanding any of his fellow commissioners, except his late Secretary of State. I assume that what is going on is that the various peace commissions of the different principal allied and associated powers, at the head of which in each instance except our own was the premier of the Nation, are still in operation upon the Austrian treaty, which involves the boundaries between Austria and Italy, and so forth, and also in relation to the Turkish treaty. As to the Bulgarian treaty, I do not remember, although it may be in the same category.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. How can that be true as far as the Austrian treaty is concerned, because that has already been signed and is in the possession of the President here, and a copy, although it did not come directly from the President, has been printed as a Senate document? But, even if that were possible, why is it that the representatives of only two nations assume to act? Why are not the other belligerents taken into consideration if that is one of the things to be settled in making a treaty, let us say, between Austria and Great Britain and France and Italy and Turkey and Bulgaria and Greece? Where are the representatives of the other belligerent nations?

The point I want to get at is, Why are these two representatives, one from France and one from Great Britain, assuming to settle this dispute, and where do they get their authority, and whom do they represent in such a settlement?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I can not answer by the card, as I stated before.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. If I correctly understand the situation with regard to the Fiume dispute, France and Great Britain, each having a treaty made heretofore with Italy for the purpose of inducing Italy to enter the war, are trying to compose the conflict between the terms of that treaty and the requirements of the Jugo-Slavs, and they therefore have upon themselves, or have assumed the burden of making, if possible, some disposition of that *impasse* which the recognition of the Jugo-Slav nation has brought about. I do not vouch for that, but such is my understanding.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Connecticut will be kind enough to permit me, I am only asking for the purpose of getting information and elucidating the question; but if we assume that the Senator from Colorado is correct, still there must come a time before this can become a part of some treaty—and I do not see how it can be effective unless it does, so long as the League of Nations is not acting—there must eventually come a time when the nations themselves must at least give their approval.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly; and I presume that time will come, if it is possible to suggest something that will be acceptable to the two contending nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we must assume, I take it, that the settlement of these two nations, although only representing themselves, and joining now with the President of the United States—the President having objected because he was not in, so that will take Great Britain, France, and the United States in on it—we must assume that their settlement, whatever it may be, is going to be formally approved by the nations that are interested in the particular treaty of which this must be a part.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly. No other nation would have the temerity to question the settlement which was agreed upon by the three principal parties to the treaty.

Mr. NORRIS. That is interesting to know. In other words, some other nation which technically, at least, had the same right to be heard, and whose signature was necessary for the approval of the treaty, would probably get into disrepute with these great powers if it presumed to have anything to say about what had been settled for it in advance and failed to put its name on the dotted line.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator's conclusion is a perfectly logical one.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, there can be no question that the weaker powers whose rights and properties are being dealt with by those who are negotiating this series of treaties will have to submit. They are helpless. When the principal allied and associated powers, who won this war and beat the great Triple Alliance which had been the terror of the world for nearly a quarter of a century—they had their armies and navies intact, greatly enhanced and increased in power. They had added thereto the entire German Navy and shipping, the disposition and operation of which could absolutely put an embargo and blockade upon the products of other nations and starve them to death, if necessary, to enforce the decrees of the great powers who are settling the disputes and determining the rights of these people who have a right to self-determination under one of the 14 points. What can Jugo-Slavia do if they are dissatisfied with the boundary between themselves and Italy or Austria? Why, immediately the league notifies its members that here is a matter concerning the peace of the world, and they make recommendations to the members of the league as to what shall be done about it. They will decide it. The treaty says they shall recommend, and they will recommend the quotas of ships and of troops and of money which the members of the league are to bring forward in the peaceful and benevolent promotion of the decision arrived at by the league in secret, star-chamber proceedings; and when our friends who are trying with honeyed words to toll us into this well-baited trap come to those articles of the covenant which, so far as they dare in cold type, set down that the star-chamber council is to apportion the quotas of death-dealing force to be furnished by each constituent member in promoting the reign of peace on earth and good will toward men—when the covenant itself sets that down, and the league is to decide how they are to be used to enforce its decisions, how much of self-determination by the poor and defenseless peoples of the world is there to be in actual practice?

If Jugo-Slavia does not accept the terms prescribed by these gentlemen who are writing state papers to each other, Jugo-Slavia had better look out; that is all there is to that. That is the way peace is to be established on earth, and to be maintained. But when article 10 is submitted to us for our approval in the name of the American people—for we represent the people, and not simply what these state papers call "the Government"; it sounds big and looks big when written with a capital "G," but it is written by one man—when we hesitate to say that we approve of the contract contained in article 10, by which we are to be made parties, and the principal parties, to an agreement by which we undertake to respect and preserve not only the territorial integrity but the political independence of every member of the league; when we hesitate and want to know what that means, and say that it is prudent for us to understand what obligation we, as the representatives of our respective States, are saddling upon the people of our States, before we do this, we are charged by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with dishonor.

Mr. President, the dishonor would come if we adopted the other course. The dishonor would come to this country and to that flag if we agreed to article 10, assuming any such contract as that. Then, when the emergency arose, and the council called upon us for our quota of troops and our billions of treasure, if we, the Senate of the United States and the great House of Representatives, should enter into a debate as to whether we were morally bound or legally bound or actually bound to do what the council said, it would be claimed that we were dishonored if we did not "go along" with what would be declared to be the unanimous voice of civilization!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator speaks of the council calling upon the United States to furnish a certain quota. The Senator, of course, will admit that the council does not call.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will use the word "recommend," if the Senator prefers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the council advises.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, what is the difference?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There never has been any question but that that is merely advice, which each Government is free to accept or reject. The Senator also admits that the council can not even give the advice unless it is unanimous, and that the United States in perpetuity has a member of that council, and the United States can control the action of the member of the council, so that the United States is in a position to prevent the council even giving the advice. How, then, can the Senator become so alarmed as to what advice the council may give?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not particularly alarmed, because we are going to keep out of this thing, Mr. President; but it has taken nearly a year to inform the American people of what they were trying to stampede them into. If we were in it, I would be alarmed, and so would the people; and I will tell the Senator how it would operate.

The Senator brings up again the specious plea that we can not be hurt, because there must be unanimity in this "advice"—think of it!—the "advice" of a council that is to rule the world! You might call it "the friendly aid and succor," if you wanted to, or if you wanted to put a little more honeyed candy on the operation. He wants to know how we can be hurt by it if it has to be unanimous and we have a delegate there.

Well, this is the way it would be done:

The President would appoint Col. House, or Mr. Bainbridge Colby, or George Creel, or some of those people whose minds "run along" with his sufficiently, as our delegate on the council of the League of Nations, and he would be there because his mind "ran along" with the President's, and if it did not he would not be there very long. He would get what they call in diplomatic language his "exequatur," his ticket of leave. It would be an indefinite leave, too. He would be home on leave, but with about the same reputation as an ordinary "ticket-of-leave" man has. Suppose the dispute between Italy and Jugo-Slavia about Fiume comes up. Nothing could be done wrongly, the Senator claims, because it all has to be unanimous. Well, while Col. House, with every sensitive tentacle stretched to intercept the most delicate agitation of the ether waves by wireless, was sitting there quivering with the anticipation of hearing his master's voice, suddenly there would be two or three clicks of the instrument operated by Mr. Tumulty en camera in the White House, and Col. House would assume a virtuous attitude and say, "I cast my vote on this great question in the interest of the plain people. I make it unanimous."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not finished with it yet. I have just started.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut further yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is aware that this side has expressed its entire willingness to have any delegate appointed either to the council or to the assembly confirmed by the Senate and his powers defined by the Congress of the United States. Under those circumstances, how can the Senator still claim that such a delegate would be under the exclusive control of the President?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why, Mr. President, I do not claim that he would be under the President's dictation if Congress should say that he should not do anything without an act of Congress; but what sort of a league are you going to have if our participation in the spiritual leadership of the universe is to consist in having a puppet over there controlled by Congress, like a bear dancing around a hand organ with a chain around his neck?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator if that reservation has yet been adopted and made a part of our resolution of ratification?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why, the Senator argued with us in the Foreign Relations Committee that it was one of the most abhorrent and destructive of all of the reservations that we had proposed; that it was a reflection upon the President and an attempt to hinder and minimize the participation of this great country in this great international body.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why, certainly; and to the Senator's colleagues also.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On the other hand, I have from the first taken the position that the powers of the delegate of the United States upon the council and in the assembly should be defined by Congress. I have at all times advocated the idea that such a representative should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and that his powers should be outlined by an act of Congress. The Senator must know that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Would the Senator be willing to say that our delegate, sitting 3,000 miles away from us in conference with the other delegates, our fellow members of the league, should not cast a vote upon any subject without instructions from Congress?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not say that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well. Unless the Senator does say that he leaves the man loose to bind us.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have said that these powers could be defined, and ought to be defined, by Congress, and when it comes to voting on a question which involves possible war and the advising of nations to raise an army, he certainly should be under the control of an act of Congress. I hope the Senator will not again put me in the position of claiming that the delegate of the United States should be exclusively under the control of the President of the United States, because I have never believed it, I have never said it, and I have always advocated the idea that his powers should be defined by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator would not vote for a resolution of ratification which contained a reservation that this delegate might not cast a vote except by authority of an act of Congress, because it would render him impotent. Of course, we might say that he shall not vote to put this country into war, but nobody expects him to vote for any such thing, and I have not claimed that he would vote for such a thing. All I claim is that the advice which he would give, the advice in which he would join, would be advice which, if it were accepted, would put us into war many times; and when that advice has been arrived at, under direction of the President who appoints his delegate, and under the direction of other delegates appointed by the premiers or the heads of the various Governments, our fellow members of the league, and a decision has been made unanimous to advise a certain thing and they all agree to it, when the matter comes before Congress, the President having agreed to it in advance, the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with his party here in Congress either in control or in a minority and in either case solid behind him pressing for it, with the whole great emergency staring civilization in the face, I want to see the puny, pigmy-minded Congressman who would rise in his place here and defy the views of

civilization. Compared with the pressure that has been put upon this body for now over a year demanding that we should sign this paper without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" and merely mumbling a few interpretative reservations, which mean nothing at all, about our understandings, with nobody else saying they agree to them, the pressure that would then be put upon us to carry out that advice would be a thousandfold more than it has been at this session of Congress, and which has already been nearly enough, in view of the suppliant attitude of some Senators, to accomplish its purpose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has shifted his position.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will shift back again.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He now claims that the Congress of the United States would not have enough independence so to define the duties of the American representative in the council of the league or in the assembly of the league as to keep us out of war; but what the Senator said when I rose to interrupt him was that we were likely to be embroiled in a war against our will, because the council might call upon us to furnish soldiers.

I called the Senator's attention to the fact that the council does not make the call in the first place; that all it does is to advise; that we are free to accept or reject that advice, like any other nation; that that advice can not even be given until the representative of the United States concurs in it; and that that representative can be bound by act of Congress in advance, so that he can not do it without consulting the views of the United States. Can the Senator get away from that conclusion?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have gotten away from it twice, but the Senator comes right back to it. I will get away the third time.

The situation is this: If you bind your delegate effectually, so that he is responsive only to Congress and not to the President, you destroy the efficiency of the league, because it can not operate; it can not act in emergencies, where a rush is to be made by what the Senator is so fond of calling a predatory nation upon its neighbor. It is a council of nine and can meet and advise something quickly; but if the representative of the greatest and richest and most powerful nation member of the league, the pack horse of the league, who is expected to pay most of the expenses and do most of the work in its passion for service and altruism, can not say yes or no until a special session of Congress is called, if we are in vacation, and we organize and debate upon how much our moral obligation weighs at that time, it will not have a very serious deterrent effect upon the nation whose troops are then crossing the bridges of the international river which divides it from its victim.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There may be some force in what the Senator says, but he has been compelled to abandon the position which he took a few moments ago that the council could involve us in war without our consent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; it would not involve us in war, because we would dishonor ourselves and not go into war. What I want to do is to get away from the "juggling fiends"—

That keep the word of promise to our ear
And break it to our hope!

I want either to assume the obligation or to refuse to assume it. The Senator wants to adopt article 10, by which foreign nations are going to be made to think that they can rely upon us as their ever-present help in time of trouble; just to sign it, guaranteeing the political independence and territorial integrity of every European and Asiatic member of the league, and when they call for help then we are to enter upon a casuistical debate upon the extent of our moral obligations, in parentheses, if any, to save civilization again. It is because, having had experience in the debate of being denounced as dishonorable people, we do not want to sign a dubious contract, as a result of which anybody can say in the future that we have made a scrap of paper of this. Is that fair to America or is it not? Our fellow members of the league are entitled to know what we are going to do if they make this international treaty with us.

Lord Grey, who is a great statesman and has had great experience in diplomacy, as we all know, came over here and waited for months for some purpose or other which was never fully revealed, to me at least, and then he sought his island home. Within a few days the Thunderer, Lord Northcliffe's vox populi, had a lengthy communication from Lord Grey, who is an observant gentleman and learned several things in this country even if he did not get into the White House. In that paper he said that he had been on the ground here, that he had talked with many Americans of all beliefs in relation to the treaty, and that he was there to say to them that if they proposed to have any dealings with this country the basis of their

dealings and the basis of the obligations that would be assumed by this country were contained in the reservations which the Senate had already adopted concerning the treaty.

He knew perfectly well what the reservation was on article 10. That reservation was that we declined to assume any obligation to protect anybody's territorial integrity or political independence. We do not ask anybody to protect ours. We do not ask this European or Asiatic league to protect the political independence of Uncle Sam nor to protect his territorial integrity. We do not protect our own territorial integrity along the Mexican border. Any bandit is free to kidnap an American citizen and string him up until he can find the resources of his friends and then name his price per head, and the Army and the Navy and the air fleet are daily ransomed in their uniforms from the agents of our great and good friend Carranza, the first chief.

But we have not called upon Europe to do it. We have called upon our own Government without success, but we never yet have demanded that Europe should do it. I believe Germany did come to our aid once and take off our distressed people from a Mexican city—I think it was Vera Cruz—when our own people would not do it. But we never yet have asked Europe to protect us.

Why do they want to drag us into protecting their political independence? Just think of it! Is it so that no government in Europe or Asia or South America is to be allowed to do anything that tends to overthrow the political independence of some other government in which we have only the most remote influence without our being summoned, under our guaranty and international undertaking, to maintain that existing status? Is it true that the people of this country actually, when you put it right up to a matter-of-fact, brass-tack vote, want the Senate to sign a contract so that if the people of Russia shall take it into their heads to march across the boundary of East India to aid an East Indian uprising against their British—what shall I call them—"benefactors" we have got to go in and put conscription back into force and summon from East, West, South, and North our military array and re-create the Shipping Board—which I hope by that time will have been abolished—to commence to build ships of mortar and steel and wood, and to have a new crusade for Liberty bonds and the Red Cross to raise money to go over and help Great Britain to keep East India, a member of the league, under the control of the British Empire? Is that what the royal American farmer wants? If he does not want it he had better keep shut of this thing, because we shall be lectured and bothered and badgered and denounced by the peoples with whom we are now on friendly relations if we do not come in to settle their troubles for them when they hoist the danger signal.

How does the unanimous requirement of the covenant protect us? You should remember this: Our delegate who sits on the council of the League of Nations engaging in these secret proceedings sits in an atmosphere to which he is not accustomed. It is a highly rarified and charged atmosphere. The delegate who sits upon the assembly to which cases can be removed from the council, and must be removed upon the mere request of any party in interest, is a gentleman who a year or two before the crisis arises left his country and has from that time lived in foreign parts. He is surrounded by the atmosphere of Europe. He reads the European newspapers. He talks several European languages or else he would not be capable of conversing with his colleagues. Every morning when he gets up he is confronted by the interests and the incidents that have happened in the capital where he is temporarily sojourning. His whole environment is that of Europe. He is under the control of the President of the United States, who appointed him. The President of the United States gets his information from his representative delegate over there.

Instead of selfishness and greed having been eliminated from human nature by the mere resolution of the Senate ratifying the treaty, human nature will go on just as it always has, and there will be just as much opportunity within the league and within the council and within the assembly for nations to look after their self-interest as there was without it, and unless selfishness has been abandoned and nations no longer look after themselves our delegate there—our one lone delegate—will be subject always to his local atmosphere and environment, to the entertainment and the numberless arts which are practiced so successfully by the diplomacy of the Old World upon our one American delegate.

He goes into the chamber alone. He is there with eight foreigners. As I said, all the President knows about what goes on behind those closed doors, in which there is an eight-to-one foreign majority, is what our delegate tells him. Our delegate and the President, having corresponded by wireless,

determine the attitude of America, and every man from Alaska to Florida and from Maine to the Hawaiian Islands under the jurisdiction of the American flag is bound by that action.

When our representative, under the instructions or the advice of the President, unless there is such a reservation or act to deprive him of his legitimate powers and render him an impotent figure, sitting there as an emblem of the impotency of this country, makes that verdict unanimous, it means something to us. You can not get away from that. There is no use to talk about it being a debating society or that it is only advice, which we can repudiate. It was upon a subject that was of sufficient international gravity to enlist the most careful thought of the ablest men of all the members of this great League of Nations, and our delegate certainly can not cast his vote except as directed by the President. If the President wants to make the vote unanimous and our man declines to do it, what becomes of him? He is not a free agent. The other men are. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is eternally right when he says that it is impossible for this country to enter into a combination providing for a council and an assembly, to be in continuous session in Europe, and appoint an accredited representative to take part in its proceedings and then to repudiate his decision.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's last statement is equally applicable to Part XIII. Once we appoint our representatives, we are in, are we not, and at least morally bound by the conclusion of the majority, or the two-thirds, which under some circumstances is made necessary in their proceedings?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; the Senator is entirely right. There is no getting away from it as a practical thing, and every American knows it. I have said repeatedly, and the more I say it the more I am convinced by my own repetition of the truth of it, that you can not half enter into an international alliance. The thing involves good faith or bad faith. It involves entire cooperation or else charges of betrayal.

There are some, and I have no quarrel with them—I am grateful to them for coming as far as they do, and I know they are acting in good faith—who believe that we have rendered America safe if we put on the reservations that the Senate has adopted. I agree with them that we have rendered the part we take in the operation of this great international machine for the enforcement of its will upon the rest of the world as safe as we can render it by the use of language; that we have protected ourselves by these reservations so far as mere words can do it. But, Mr. President, when this foreign assembly, utterly without any warrant from the people of America, have sat for a week or a month, being drawn from one position to another, and our delegate, being operated upon in various manners, drawn from one admission to another, finally take their view of it, what do our reservations amount to really?

It will have been demonstrated that they are mere paper reservations; that they can not control the practice of the thing; that they can not control the operation of it. We can say that our domestic questions shall not be under the jurisdiction of either the council or the assembly. Well, we can say it, but in the great interweaving of the commercial and other transactions of the world, the blending of interstate into foreign commerce, the mutual interplay of all the great financial and commercial relations of the nations of the world, these reservations and the things with which they deal will fade into "innocuous desuetude"; they will be worth nothing in practice. When our delegate wants to repel the overpowering strength of the eight foreigners who are forcing him into a corner to secure that one vote necessary to unanimity, when he hunts through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day or yesterday to pick out the little reservation which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has now pending before the Senate, in order to hold it up to these Europeans, I can see the look on their faces. They will simply laugh at it. "Why, yes," they will say, "that is what the recalcitrant Senate thought back in 1920, but the world has moved; it is now 1924, and you have been associated with us, going along with us, and our great international bankers have made all these interlocking, guaranteed poolings of the debts of the war, and their commissions are all based upon your voting to go along with us. My God! you are not going to desert us now; the crack of doom will impend, and we shall hold you up as a 'hermit nation,' and there are the provisions for boycotts in this league, and all sorts of horrible things will happen to you." And the President will order him to vote with them.

There is nothing to it. This is either a good thing or it is a bad thing. Those who think it is a good thing ought to be per-

fectly willing to vote for it as it stood, as 38 Democrats did; those who think it is a good thing ought not to put on any reservations, because it does not need them; those who think it is a bad thing ought, if they have sense enough to see that it is a bad thing, to have sense enough to know that a bad thing can not be made a good thing by a few reservations. Here is a great international trust to be organized, and we are a little leery about trusts; we think they are against public policy and against democracy, and we do not like to go in; but we will say, "Well, if you will let us in in a limited liability kind of way, so that we can claim that we are not really in the trust, and will put in some things to save our faces in case we are indicted for a criminal conspiracy, we will join."

It does not "listen good" to me, Mr. President. I believe that America, if it wants international leadership, if it wants to establish its ideal of morality and fair play and justice, if it is higher than that of other nations—and we think it is—will stand an infinitely better chance of accomplishing those objects by staying out of the intricacies and concealed and half-visible doubts and entanglements of this league. Standing clear, America can be of a thousand times more influence for justice and for international good will and for peace and good order upon the earth as the free, independent America, which we were founded to be and hitherto always have been, than we can as the internationalized and denationalized partner of this new internationalism.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the pending controversy over Fiume is very prominent just now, because of the publication of the correspondence between the President and the two principal members of the supreme council, of which we have just been informed. It presents a situation which seems to be fraught with tremendous possible consequences and affords a graphic illustration of the perils which I fear will beset the United States in the event it becomes a partner and associate in the proposed League of Nations.

The extent of the territory involved is trivial, but the consequences which may flow from its forcible adjustment or even from a peaceful solution seem to me to be very serious and far-reaching.

The insistence of the President upon the understanding which he approved during the closing days of the last year and which he now maintains must be observed, unless the two nations which are directly in interest shall otherwise agree, which is highly improbable, will in all likelihood encourage and stimulate the Jugo-Slavic nation to an insistence upon all that is involved in that agreement. It is but natural that, having the sanction of the greatest Nation in the world behind them, they should feel indisposed to yield anything, whereas without that sanction the difficulty might be adjusted. In the event the solution becomes impossible—and I fear that will be the situation—the result is obvious, and war may again make its appearance between two great European nations.

Italy has behind it the sanction of her treaty of 1915 with France and England. Jugo-Slavia has behind it the sanction of the Government of the United States, and, in the event of hostilities, the moral obligation now imposed upon the United States would certainly require its recognition of her cause. That means but one thing—our participation in another European war, or our refusal to sustain our present attitude by force. In the one instance we may be involved in a conflict which may be precipitated between ourselves and some of our recent allies; in the other we will be justly charged with a repudiation of a doctrine upon the strength of which one nation was encouraged to persist in its demands, and which has a consequent right to depend upon us for aid, should appeal be made to the sword.

On the other hand, any settlement resulting from the position the United States now occupies, whatever that settlement may be, will necessarily arouse in the disappointed nation a feeling of resentment toward the United States, national in its character, and which may, in the course of time, develop into serious controversy. All of which indicates the contingencies confronting us as a member of the league in conjunction with every dispute in which we may be called upon to participate and which our potent influence may determine.

It is the most obvious thing in the world, it is a matter of our daily experience, that the individual involved in a controversy seldom loses, whether by arbitration or by the judgment of a court, without feeling that injustice has been done him, and without inwardly resolving to take advantage of any opportunity which may be offered in the future for his satisfaction. That which the individual feels because of his controversy, the nations, which are collections of individuals only, entertain perhaps in much greater degree. I can not, therefore, but regard the incident as in some respects providential, should we give it

due heed, since it reveals with the utmost clearness the responsibilities which we are about to assume, not for one year or two years, which is a contingency, but for all time.

The very fact that the United States is the greatest Nation in the world and isolated from the other great powers will naturally make it the arbiter of arbiters in all disputes between European and Asiatic countries. We must assume the responsibility, therefore, of deciding those disputes or, at least, of shifting the equilibrium between the two sides in the one way or the other, and in every instance where we settle the dispute we create another enemy. Instead, therefore, of contributing to the harmony of nations, it would seem, if we are to take this incident as an illustration of what we shall encounter, that harmony will be obtained at the expense of American popularity and leadership. Such a price no nation, however powerful, can afford to pay.

There is another thought which has occurred to me, Mr. President, in connection with this controversy. However much we may attempt to safeguard the Monroe doctrine, either in the text of the treaty or by reservations, we can not both enter the league and also preserve the integrity of that policy. Our union in a great family of nations will prove entirely inconsistent in practice, although it may not in theory, with our reservation of that great policy which has shaped the destiny of the Western Hemisphere ever since its announcement and whose continual recognition is admittedly essential to the welfare and the future of the American Republic.

This contention can be illustrated by a situation on the Western Hemisphere which is analogous to that of Fiume. I refer to the dispute now and for some time existing between Peru and Chile over two provinces which, at the close of the war between those two countries, were taken over by Chile to be held for a certain number of years.

Chile contends that her right to those provinces is permanent; Peru contends that the terms of the treaty having been complied with, they should be restored to her, while Bolivia insists upon one of them, that she may have an outlet to the sea. Here are the conditions of a grave international controversy, first, between two nations claiming the same territory, and, second, between these and Bolivia, once the owner of one of the provinces, shut off from the sea, and entitled by all the principles of economic justice to access to the highways of the sea for her foreign trade.

When the league is established, this controversy must go to it for solution, if the nations parties to it belong to the league, or if it threatens the peace of nations, whether they belong to it or not.

Now, let us assume, Mr. President, that the league disposes of that controversy, after due consideration, in a manner unsatisfactory to the United States, albeit the decision may have been assented to by our representative. It certainly will not be satisfactory to the nation or two of the three nations whose interests are adverse to the ultimate decision. But the league, having made the decision, must enforce it whether satisfactory or not. The sympathies of the United States—indeed, the interests of the United States—may be with the disappointed party; and yet, the Monroe doctrine to the contrary notwithstanding, our membership in the league would preclude us from doing otherwise than recognizing the decision and contributing the forces of our Army, our Navy, and our Treasury to its establishment.

We can, if my illustration be reliable, decline to do anything; but that would involve a condition not compatible with the integrity of American agreements. We might protest, but our protest might be unavailing. If we should resort to the principle of the Monroe doctrine to vindicate our attitude, we would repudiate the covenant of the league. If we acquiesced in the decision of the league, although inimical to ourselves, we would abandon the Monroe doctrine pro tanto. Sooner or later that controversy will become acute, league or no league. It is even now of serious proportions. It would seem to me, therefore, that the Fiume incident offers a striking example of the dangers involved in the League of Nations and a solemn warning against our entry into it.

I may be prejudiced regarding this subject. It may be that the situation is otherwise than as it appears to me; yet so serious is it that the President of the United States justifies his insistence upon its adjustments in harmony with his own view that he contemplates a withdrawal of the treaty, which means its abrogation, unless his demand be complied with. I can not therefore overemphasize its importance or draw too somber a lesson from the consequences which it forebodes once we enter upon this new and untried experiment and take what Lord Grey happily calls this "plunge into the unknown."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Knox	Sheppard
Ball	Gronna	Lenroot	Shields
Borah	Hale	Lodge	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Harding	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harris	McLean	Smoot
Chamberlain	Harrison	Myers	Spencer
Colt	Henderson	New	Sterling
Culberson	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Trammell
Edkins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Underwood
Fernald	Kellogg	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
France	Kenyon	Pittman	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Poin Dexter	
Gay	King	Pomerene	
Gerry	Kirby	Ransdell	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the construction given to-day by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] of the substitute which he has offered. I read it to show that his own statement construes it as being an amendment to the treaty. I congratulate him that he has gotten away from interpretative reservations:

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean to say that no nation, the United States nor any other nation, shall be compelled to submit to the council a domestic question, nor to permit the council to decide what is a domestic question.

There we have his declaration that this substitute is to prevent the council from deciding what is a domestic question. Here is the treaty. It declares that the members agree either to arbitrate every dispute or to submit them to the council. Now, I will read the provision of the covenant on disputes when one of the parties claims it is a domestic question:

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendations as to its settlement.

So that the league covenant expressly provides that the council shall pass upon the question as to whether a particular dispute falls within the class of a domestic dispute. The substitute of the Senator from Nebraska, according to his own interpretation, takes away from the league the right to decide what is and what is not a domestic question, and it takes it away not only so far as the United States is concerned, but as to all nations members of the league. It changes the substance of the league covenant.

I am glad that the Senator realizes that there are provisions in the league covenant that can not be handled by interpretation and that require change. I have insisted for some time that there were provisions in the league covenant to which we should not submit and that by reservations we should take ourselves out from under objectionable provisions. That can be done, leaving other nations to stay under the terms of the provisions if they wish.

Only a few days ago Switzerland went into the league, reserving to herself freedom from the obligation of article 10 to put her troops behind the countries, members of the league, that might be involved in war, and also reserving to herself the right to refuse to permit armies to pass through Switzerland, making two distinct reservations taking Switzerland out from under two distinct provisions of the league covenant. So we can take our country out from under provisions if we wish.

I object to this amendment, not because I object to freeing the United States from the objectionable provision as to domestic questions, but because, if we amend the treaty, it must go back to the conference in Paris. It must go back to the countries that have already ratified it. It is a change of the substance of the covenant; not merely a refusal, so far as we are concerned, to submit to the particular provision.

This amendment by the Senator from Nebraska would greatly delay if it did not defeat acceptance by the other countries of ratification by the United States. It is more objectionable than the reservation reported by the committee. I am opposed to it because I favor ratification with reservations and not with amendments.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would like to have a vote upon this matter this afternoon. I have no particular desire to delay the matter unduly, but I wonder if the Senator would be willing to have unanimous consent given to vote upon it on Monday not later than 1 o'clock, and permit the vote to go over until that time?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator means on the reservation and the two pending amendments?

Mr. BORAH. I mean on reservation 4 and all amendments which may be offered to it.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; there are two pending.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether that request would contemplate that there should be no debate beyond 1 o'clock if substitutes should be offered for the pending reservation?

Mr. BORAH. Of course I contemplate that, but I would be perfectly willing to modify it to a later hour if the Senator thinks he would want some little time. My opinion is that this matter can be voted on immediately upon coming in; and then if we said "not later than 1 o'clock" the Senator would have time to present his amendment.

Mr. KING. I shall take only a moment or two to submit the substitute which I shall offer for the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts; but there may be a number of other reservations offered in the form of substitutes or there may be amendments offered to the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is now late on Saturday afternoon. I should be glad to make such an arrangement; but if Senators on the other side are going to insist that more time than two hours shall be given to discuss a subject that we have been discussing now for 48 hours, of course I shall feel bound to hold the Senate in session as late as I can.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would suggest that the Senator make his request for 2 o'clock. A number of Senators are out of the city, and if the matter is not to be voted on to-day it is just as well to let it go to that hour, so as to accommodate them until their return. If the Senator will make it 2 o'clock, that will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to make it 2 o'clock, but if that is to be done I shall have to ask that when the Senate adjourns it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday. The Military Academy appropriation bill ought to be taken up and disposed of promptly, and I should like to have an hour extra for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. If it is understood that the hour extra will be used for that purpose, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. LODGE. I will ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] if he thinks the bill can be disposed of in that time?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it can be disposed of in an hour.

Mr. BORAH. It was not the limit of time upon the Military Academy bill to which I referred, but it is the understanding that that bill is to be taken up the first thing?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; immediately upon the convening of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I will ask the Senator if he will prefer a request for unanimous consent to vote on this reservation at 2 o'clock?

Mr. LODGE. I will. I must ask now for a brief executive session. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without further debate the vote be taken on reservation No. 4 and all pending amendments at 2 o'clock on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will reduce the proposed agreement to writing and state it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 2 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, March 1, 1920, the Senate will proceed to vote without further debate upon reported reservation No. 4 to the treaty of peace with Germany, any amendment that may then be pending or that may be offered thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

EXECUTIVE SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors.

The motion was agreed to, and the doors were closed. After 10 minutes the doors were reopened and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 27), 1920.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

Bainbridge Colby, of New York, to be Secretary of State, vice Robert Lansing, resigned.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

George W. P. Hunt, of Arizona, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Siam.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Estelle V. Collier, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 48, with headquarters at Salt Lake City, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John D. Lynn, of Rochester, N. Y., to be United States marshal, western district of New York. (A reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The following-named officer of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer):

Henry Bowers Campbell, of New York, vice J. A. Daniels, resigned.

The following-named officer of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid):

Robert Francis Anthony Studds, of the District of Columbia, vice W. T. Combs, promoted.

INTERNATIONAL TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONFERENCE.

The following-named persons as representatives of the Government of the United States to participate in an international conference to be held in Washington to consider all international aspects of communication by telegraph, telephone, cable, wireless telephone, and wireless telegraphy, and to make recommendations with a view to providing the entire world with adequate facilities for international communication on a fair and equitable basis:

Albert S. Burleson, of Texas, Postmaster General of the United States.

Rear Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, retired.

Walter S. Rogers, of LaGrange, Ill.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Noel Davis to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 25th day of September, 1919.

Lieut. Carl H. Jones to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 20th day of October, 1919.

Medical Inspector Edgar Thompson to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 28th day of December, 1919.

Surg. Aulsebrook H. Robnett to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October, 1919.

Surg. Spencer L. Higgins to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 23d day of October, 1919.

Surg. Harry R. Hermes to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 28th day of December, 1919.

Lieut. Philip B. Becker, United States Naval Reserve Corps, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1919.

Paymaster Frederick B. Colby to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 12th day of October, 1919.

Paymaster Edward E. Goodhue to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 30th day of October, 1919.

Naval Constructor Ernest F. Eggert to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 18th day of November, 1919.

Naval Constructor Andrew W. Carmichael to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 16th day of November, 1919.

The following-named officers to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 18th day of November, 1919:

Thomas B. Richey and

Henry E. Rossell.

Capt. William R. Shoemaker to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

John T. Tompkins,
Hutch I. Cone,
Ernest L. Bennett, and
Franklin D. Karns.

Commander John V. Klemann to be captain in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1919.

Commander William H. Standley to be a captain in the Navy from the 22d day of December, 1919.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Victor S. Houston,
Merlyn G. Cook,
Lewis Cox, Jr.,
William H. Allen,
Jesse B. Gay,
John V. Babcock,
James O. Richardson,
Lewis B. Porterfield,
David A. Weaver,
Frederick R. Naile,
John P. Jackson,
Theodore A. Kittinger,
Joseph L. Hileman,
William W. Galbraith,
Rufus F. Zogbaum, jr.,
George J. Meyers,
Adolphus Staton,
Neil E. Nichols, and
Charles W. Early.

Lieut. Commander John F. Green to be a commander in the Navy from the 20th day of July, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Edward C. S. Parker to be a commander in the Navy from the 17th day of August, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Frank B. Freyer to be a commander in the Navy from the 25th day of September, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Carlos Bean to be a commander in the Navy from the 20th day of October, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Roscoe C. Davis to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of October, 1919.

Lieut. Commander John A. Monroe to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Randall Jacobs,
Ralph C. Needham,
John H. Hoover,
George W. Kenyon,
William S. Farber,
Baxter H. Bruce,
Elmer W. Tod,
Robert T. S. Lowell,
Irving H. Mayfield,
Raymond F. Frelsen,
John M. Schelling,
Harry J. Abbett,
Thomas A. Symington,
William F. Amsden, and
Charles C. Windsor.

Lieut. Alexander M. Charlton to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1919.

Lieut. Kirkwood H. Donavin to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 22d day of December, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919:

Lloyd R. Gray,
Henry M. Briggs,
Walter E. Doyle,
Paul Hendren,
Thomas G. Berrien, and
Stuart E. Bray.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Valentine Wood to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Ensign John J. Mahoney to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1919:

Paul W. Rutledge, and
Knefler McGinnis.

Medical Inspector Granville L. Angeny to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 28th day of December, 1919.

Surg. Henry A. May to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Surg. Norman T. McLean to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 5th day of October, 1919.

Assistant Surgeon for Temporary Service Wendell P. Blake to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 15th day of January, 1920.

Passed Asst. Surg. James B. Moloney, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 15th day of January, 1920.

Professor of Mathematics William S. Eichelberger to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 18th day of September, 1918.

Naval Constructor James L. Ackerson to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 21st day of January, 1920.

Boatswain David F. Mead to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 19th day of February, 1918.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 11th day of January, 1919:

John H. MacDonald and
Nathan E. Cook.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1919:

Charles W. Wagner,
William W. Holton,
Max Bayer,
George F. Veth,
Charles J. Naprstek, and
William S. Evans.

Lieut. Commander William D. Puleston to be a commander in the Navy from the 19th day of November, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Earl P. Finney to be a commander in the Navy from the 22d day of October, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

George W. Simpson and
Elmo H. Williams.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

William L. Jones to be postmaster at Parrish, Ala., in place of R. G. Waldrop, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

ARKANSAS.

Azro C. Brooks to be postmaster at Harrison, Ark., in place of J. B. Holder, resigned.

FLORIDA.

Sallie Grace to be postmaster at Graceville, Fla., in place of Walter Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

MARYLAND.

Donald E. Clark to be postmaster at Silver Springs, Md., in place of C. A. Barnes, deceased.

MICHIGAN.

Estella R. Newcomb to be postmaster at Le Roy, Mich., in place of G. W. Parker, resigned.

Edward F. Eversole to be postmaster at Redford, Mich., in place of C. A. Lahser, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Ward W. Miller to be postmaster at Bayard, Nebr., in place of G. C. Fox, resigned.

Leah P. Rice to be postmaster at Harrison, Nebr., in place of Alexander Lowry, resigned.

Clifford R. Young to be postmaster at Marquette, Nebr., in place of L. L. Colby, declined.

Harry M. Townsend to be postmaster at Minatare, Nebr., in place of E. O. Harshman, resigned.

Etta H. Bartlett to be postmaster at Potter, Nebr., in place of Fred Nelson, deceased.

George E. Barto to be postmaster at Wakefield, Nebr., in place of Byron Busby, resigned.

George E. Gilpin to be postmaster at Wilsonville, Nebr., in place of F. R. Parker, resigned.

NEW JERSEY.

Gunnar A. Spangberg to be postmaster at New Egypt, N. J., in place of W. T. Nash, resigned.

William G. Cowgill to be postmaster at Paulsboro, N. J., in place of W. J. Cowgill, to correct name.

NEW YORK.

Leon Pralatowski to be postmaster at Cold Spring, N. Y., in place of Otis Montrose, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John E. Nelson to be postmaster at Litchville, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Christensen, resigned.

Henry Branderhorst to be postmaster at Ray, N. Dak., in place of N. W. Moelbring, resigned.

Michael Coyne to be postmaster at Starkweather, N. Dak., in place of P. F. Meharry, resigned.

Andrew M. Hewson to be postmaster at Wimbledon, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Swartwout, resigned.

OHIO.

John E. Futhey to be postmaster at Adena, Ohio, in place of W. P. Moore, resigned.

Henry W. Streb to be postmaster at Dover, Ohio, in place of H. W. Streb. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

Fred D. Hart to be postmaster at Garrettsville, Ohio, in place of G. L. Higby, resigned.

Ethel D. Young to be postmaster at Linden Heights, Ohio, in place of O. M. Brobst, resigned.

Robert E. Friel to be postmaster at Lore City, Ohio, in place of C. H. Robertson, resigned.

Edwin H. Hayman to be postmaster at Murray, Ohio, in place of W. M. Polling, declined.

Allan R. Trumbull to be postmaster at Swanton, Ohio, in place of A. A. Lathrop, deceased.

Asher O. Earley to be postmaster at Woodsfield, Ohio, in place of Thurman Springs, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

Frank S. Neptune to be postmaster at Bartlesville, Okla., in place of Frederick McDaniel, removed.

Harry T. Wolfe to be postmaster at Bristow, Okla., in place of H. F. Wolfe, to correct name.

Blanche R. Harrison to be postmaster at Byars, Okla., in place of E. R. Harrison, resigned.

Paul H. Shelton to be postmaster at Covington, Okla., in place of O. J. Conner, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alva G. Sweezy to be postmaster at Quapaw, Okla., in place of G. U. Jennison, removed. Office became presidential January 1, 1918.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Edward C. Eichholtz to be postmaster at Drexel Hill, Pa., in place of M. S. Kerney, resigned.

Rollo E. Shirey to be postmaster at Foxburg, Pa., in place of J. M. Keesey, removed.

Stanley M. Williams to be postmaster at Hop Bottom, Pa., in place of J. W. Bisbee, resigned.

Laura M. Peacock to be postmaster at Houston, Pa., in place of T. A. Riggle, resigned.

Robert F. Turner to be postmaster at Lincoln University, Pa., in place of J. H. Turner, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

William R. Williams to be postmaster at Bells, Tenn., in place of G. W. Bell, resigned.

TEXAS.

Arthur E. Davis to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, Tex., in place of Dattie McFall, resigned.

Edgar Lewis to be postmaster at Mesquite, Tex., in place of E. P. Shands, resigned.

Duane B. Scarborough to be postmaster at Oakwood, Tex., in place of Claude Wiley, resigned.

Edmond L. Wheeler to be postmaster at Paducah, Tex., in place of W. B. Stradley, resigned.

UTAH.

Thomas C. Smiley to be postmaster at Helper, Utah, in place of L. E. Young, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Stella I. Wells to be postmaster at Bethany, W. Va., in place of W. E. Reeves, removed.

WASHINGTON.

Mabel G. Lamm to be postmaster at Burlington, Wash., in place of Thomas McIntyre, deceased.

Garrett R. Patterson to be postmaster at Malden, Wash., in place of G. R. Patterson, resigned.

Kathryn Fenton to be postmaster at Orting, Wash., in place of James O'Farrell, jr., removed.

Ethel M. DeLong to be postmaster at St. John, Wash., in place of J. C. Crane, resigned.

Rose M. Illy to be postmaster at Uniontown, Wash., in place of M. A. Illy, resigned.

Julia Estes to be postmaster at White Salmon, Wash., in place of G. G. Crow, resigned.

WYOMING.

William B. Cooper to be postmaster at Green River, Wyo., in place of W. A. Johnson, resigned.

Rachael G. Chappell to be postmaster at Superior, Wyo., in place of F. S. Heltz, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 27), 1920.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

John Barton Payne to be Secretary of the Interior.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Wayne Johnson to be Solicitor of Internal Revenue.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Col. Charles L. Potter to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission.

Lieut. Col. Herbert Deakyne to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Lieut. Col. Harry Burgess to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

William A. Kelly to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Nevada.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles D. McAvoy to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Ernest Werner Eickleberg to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

Earl Oscar Heaton to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

Louis Morris Zeskind to be an aid in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Henry Caperton Warwick to be an aid in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Jacob Stanley Rosenthal to be an aid in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

POSTMASTERS.

KANSAS.

Siegfried Kuraner, Fort Leavenworth.

Frederick D. Lamb, Manhattan.

Anna M. Bryan, Mullinville.

Robert J. Rowe, Ogden.

MINNESOTA.

Frederic E. Hamlin, Chaska.

Mary I. McGuire, Norwood.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 27), 1920.

POSTMASTER.

MICHIGAN.

Wallace Grace to be postmaster at Redford, Mich.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Omnipotent, Omniscient, Omnipresent God, our Father, ever ready to uphold, sustain, and guide Thy children. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

Even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me.

Help us to conserve our intellectual, moral, and spiritual gifts against the day of disaster and sorrows, when the earth seems to be slipping from beneath our feet and all that we hold dear seems lost.

Teach us that the fairest temple we can build out of the material Thou hast given us is a patient, honest, pure, noble, generous soul—fit temple for the indwelling of Thy spirit.

The man who goes ahead and tries
To do his level best
Has little time to criticize
The failures of the rest.

So help us to live, and aspire, and pray, after the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Richmond, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, had insisted upon its amendments Nos. 17, 22, and 34, had asked the House for a further conference on the part of the Senate, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission to confer with the Dominion Government or the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick as to certain restrictive orders in council of the said Provinces relative to the exportation of pulp wood therefrom to the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on February 27, 1920, approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 3654. An act to authorize the governor of the Territory of Hawaii to acquire privately owned lands and rights of way within the boundaries of the Hawaii National Park.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE AT SUNDAY SESSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] to preside at the memorial exercises to-morrow.

PILGRIM TERCENTENARY.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Joint Special Committee on the Pilgrim Tercentenary Observations and ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts presents a report from the Joint Special Committee on the Pilgrim Tercentenary Observations and asks that it be printed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. It will be printed and referred to the Committee on the Library.

CORRECTION.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of February 25, 1920, page 3481, I am quoted as follows:

I remember the Director of the Mint two years ago was the only man who recommended that this office be abolished, and he stated that it was only a gunshot distance from Denver. Since then he has studied his geography, and has found out that Salt Lake City is as far from Denver as New York is from Chicago in point of time, and that would be the nearest place to which these prospectors would take their samples.

The present Director of the Mint, Mr. Raymond T. Baker, telephones me that the statement just quoted does him an injustice, as he is not now and never has been in favor of abolishing the assay office at Salt Lake City, stating that no one acquainted with the practical benefits of the Government assay offices in the mining regions would so recommend. I desire to do no injustice to Mr. Baker, and upon looking up the record I find that the recommendation to which I alluded was made three years ago by the then Director of the Mint, a gentleman named F. J. H. von Engelken.

The SPEAKER. This does not seem to be a correction of the RECORD.

Mr. MAYS. I will come to that in a moment. My statement, therefore, should read "three years ago" instead of "two years ago," and I ask that the correction be made accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman wishes to change the statement that he made?

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF DISABLED OFFICERS.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs I ask unanimous consent for a reference of the bill H. R. 10835, to fix the compensation of officers of the National Army who incurred disability while in the service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. It is to refer the bill from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the bill would more properly go to the Committee on Ways and Means under the resolution adopted the other day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. ESCH. It is a bill that involves very large expenditures.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have authority to so refer it, if the gentleman's suggestion is correct; but at first blush the Chair thinks that that is not so.

Mr. GARNER. This refers to officers and men who were in the service?

Mr. KAHN. It gives them increased compensation.

Mr. GARNER. Under the war-risk insurance act, and applies only to those who were wounded in the service?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly.

Mr. GARNER. If I understood the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], he stated that the purpose of his resolution was to take from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee only such matters that were general in their nature and which did not refer specifically to those who were wounded or who suffered injury in the service.

Mr. MONDELL. This bill belongs clearly to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does this increase war-risk compensation or increase the salaries of men on the retired list?

Mr. KAHN. It does not affect anyone on the retired list. These men were in the service and go out of the service as soon as they are honorably discharged. They are no longer connected with the service.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does it increase the pay while they are in the service?

Mr. KAHN. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO FARM-LOAN ACT.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9065) to amend sections 3, 8, 10, 12, 20, and 21 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a conference report, which will be printed under the rule.

SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES IN ADMIRALTY (S. DOC. NO. 233)—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (S. 3076) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on the bill S. 3076 and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, has there been a full agreement in this matter?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; there is a full agreement, and it is substantially as it was passed by the House, with some slight changes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3076) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment insert the following:

"That no vessel owned by the United States or by any corporation in which the United States or its representatives shall own the entire outstanding capital stock or in the possession of the United States or of such corporation or operated by or for the United States or such corporation, and no cargo owned or possessed by the United States or by such corporation, shall hereafter, in view of the provision herein made for a libel in personam, be subject to arrest or seizure by judicial process in the United States or its possessions: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to the Panama Railroad Co.

"SEC. 2. That in cases where if such vessel were privately owned or operated, or if such cargo were privately owned and possessed, a proceeding in admiralty could be maintained at the time of the commencement of the action herein provided for, a libel in personam may be brought against the United States or against such corporation, as the case may be, provided that such vessel is employed as a merchant vessel or is a tugboat operated by such corporation. Such suits shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the parties so suing, or any of them, reside or have their principal place of business in the United States, or in which the vessel or cargo charged with liability is found. The libellant shall forthwith serve a copy of his libel on the United States attorney for such district and mail a copy thereof by registered mail to the Attorney General of the United States, and shall file a sworn return of such service and mailing. Such service and mailing shall constitute valid service on the United States and such corporation. In case the United States or such corporation shall file a libel in rem or in personam in any district, a cross-libel in personam may be filed or a set-off claimed against the United States or such corporation with the same force and effect as if the libel had been filed by a private party. Upon application of either party the cause may, in the discretion of the court, be transferred to any other district court of the United States.

"SEC. 3. That such suits shall proceed and shall be heard and determined according to the principles of law and to the rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties. A decree against the United States or such corporation may include costs of suit, and when the decree is for a money judgment, interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum until satisfied, or at any higher rate which shall be stipulated in any contract upon which such decree shall be based. Interest shall run as ordered by the court. Decrees shall be subject to appeal and revision as now provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. If the libellant so elects in his libel suit the suit may proceed in accordance with the principles of libels in rem wherever it shall appear that had the vessel or cargo been privately owned and possessed a libel in rem might have been maintained. Election so to proceed shall not preclude the libellant in any proper case from seeking relief in personam in the same suit. Neither the United States nor such corporation shall be required to give any bond or admiralty stipulation on any proceeding brought hereunder. Any such bond or stipulation heretofore given in admiralty causes by the United States, the United States Shipping Board, or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, shall become void and be surrendered and canceled upon the filing of a suggestion by the Attorney General or other duly authorized law officer that the United States is interested in such cause, and assumes liability to satisfy any decree included within said bond or stipulation, and thereafter any such decree shall be paid as provided in section 8 of this act.

"SEC. 4. That if a privately owned vessel not in the possession of the United States or of such corporation is arrested or attached upon any cause of action arising or alleged to have arisen from previous possession, ownership, or operation of such vessel by the United States or by such corporation, such vessel shall be released without bond or stipulation therefor upon the suggestion by the United States through its Attorney General or other duly authorized law officer, that it is interested in such cause, desires such release, and assumes the liability for the satisfaction of any decree obtained by the libellant in such cause, and thereafter such cause shall proceed against the United States in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. That suits as herein authorized may be brought only on causes of action arising since April 6, 1917, provided that suits based on causes of action arising prior to the taking effect of this act shall be brought within one year after this act goes into effect; and all other suits hereunder shall be brought within two years after the cause of action arises.

"SEC. 6. That the United States or such corporation shall be entitled to the benefits of all exemptions and of all limita-

tions of liability accorded by law to the owners, charterers, operators, or agents of vessels.

"SEC. 7. That if any vessel or cargo within the purview of sections 1 and 4 of this act is arrested, attached, or otherwise seized by process of any court in any country other than the United States, or if any suit is brought therein against the master of any such vessel for any cause of action arising from, or in connection with, the possession, operation, or ownership of any such vessel, or the possession, carriage, or ownership of any such cargo, the Secretary of State of the United States in his discretion, upon the request of the Attorney General of the United States, or any other officer duly authorized by him, may direct the United States consul residing at or nearest the place at which such action may have been commenced to claim such vessel or cargo as immune from such arrest, attachment, or other seizure, and to execute an agreement, undertaking, bond, or stipulation for and on behalf of the United States, or the United States Shipping Board, or such corporation as by said court required, for the release of such vessel or cargo, and for the prosecution of any appeal; or may, in the event of such suits against the master of any such vessel, direct said United States consul to enter the appearance of the United States, or of the United States Shipping Board, or of such corporation, and to pledge the credit thereof to the payment of any judgment and cost that may be entered in such suit. The Attorney General is hereby vested with power and authority to arrange with any bank, surety company, person, firm, or corporation in the United States, its Territories and possessions, or in any foreign country, to execute any such aforesaid bond or stipulation as surety or stipulator thereon, and to pledge the credit of the United States to the indemnification of such surety or stipulator as may be required to secure the execution of such bond or stipulation. The presentation of a copy of the judgment roll in any such suit, certified by the clerk of the court and authenticated by the certificate and seal of the United States consul claiming such vessel or cargo, or his successor, and by the certificate of the Secretary of State as to the official capacity of such consul, shall be sufficient evidence to the proper accounting officers of the United States, or of the United States Shipping Board, or of such corporation, for the allowance and payment of such judgments: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be held to prejudice or preclude a claim of the immunity of such vessel or cargo from foreign jurisdiction in a proper case.

"SEC. 8. That any final judgment rendered in any suit herein authorized, and any final judgment within the purview of sections 4 and 7 of this act, and any arbitration award or settlement had and agreed to under the provisions of section 9 of this act shall, upon the presentation of a duly authenticated copy thereof, be paid by the proper accounting officers of the United States out of any appropriation or insurance fund or other fund especially available therefor; otherwise there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, a sum sufficient to pay any such judgment or award or settlement.

"SEC. 9. That the Secretary of any department of the Government of the United States, or the United States Shipping Board, or the board of trustees of such corporation, having control of the possession or operation of any merchant vessel, are, and each hereby is, authorized to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim in which suit will lie under the provisions of sections 2, 4, 7, and 10 of this act.

"SEC. 10. That the United States, and the crew of any merchant vessel owned or operated by the United States, or such corporation, shall have the right to collect and sue for salvage services rendered by such vessel and crew, and any moneys recovered therefrom by the United States for its own benefit, and not for the benefit of the crew, shall be covered into the United States Treasury, to the credit of the department of the Government of the United States, or of the United States Shipping Board, or of such corporation having control of the possession or operation of such vessels.

"SEC. 11. That all moneys recovered in any suit brought by the United States on any cause of action arising from, or in connection with, the possession, operation, or ownership of any merchant vessel, or the possession, carriage, or ownership of any cargo, shall be covered into the United States Treasury to the credit of the department of the Government of the United States, or of the United States Shipping Board, or of such aforesaid corporation, having control of the vessel or cargo with respect to which such cause of action arises, for reimbursement of the appropriation, or insurance fund, or other funds, from which the loss, damage, or compensation for which said judgment was recovered has been or will be paid.

"SEC. 12. That the Attorney General shall report to the Congress at each session thereof the suits under this act in which

final judgment, shall have been rendered for or against the United States and such aforesaid corporation, and the Secretary of any department of the Government of the United States, and the United States Shipping Board, and the board of trustees of any such aforesaid corporation, shall likewise report the arbitrations awards or settlements of claims which shall have been agreed to since the previous session, and in which the time to appeal shall have expired or have been waived.

"Sec. 13. That the provisions of all other acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

And the House agree to the same.

A. J. VOLSTEAD,
DICK T. MORGAN,
RICHARD S. WHALEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
F. M. SIMMONS,
CHAS. L. McNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3076) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes, submit the following statement:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agrees to the same with the following amendments:

1. Section 1 of the House amendment has been rewritten. As amended it eliminates the provision declaring all vessels of the United States to be public vessels, and excludes the Panama Railway Co. from the operation of the bill.

2. In section 2 the words "or intended to be employed in the carriage of cargoes or of passengers for hire" have been stricken out, and the words "as a merchant vessel or as a tugboat operated by such corporation." The effect of this change is to exclude from the scope of the bill certain public vessels not employed as merchant vessels but that occasionally carry persons and property for hire, and to make certain that tugboats employed as auxiliaries to the merchant fleet are made subject to the proposed act.

3. Two verbal changes have been made in section 5. The word "only" has been inserted after the word "brought," in the first line of the section, and the words "approval of this act" have been changed to "taking effect of this act." The word "only" was inserted to make certain that only suits on causes of action originating after April 6, 1917, are authorized.

4. At the end of section 7 the following words have been added: "in a proper case." This effects no change.

A. J. VOLSTEAD,
DICK T. MORGAN,
RICHARD S. WHALEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As I understood this bill as it passed the House and the Senate, it was to take away the right of libel of certain Government-owned vessels where that right now exists?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is the purpose.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Now, the amendment to section 2 as agreed to by the conferees, I take it, is not to enlarge in any way that question; but to prevent some naval vessels or other vessels from being considered as being subject to libel or suit at all. Is that right?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; certain vessels, such as transports, occasionally carry passengers or carry freight, I am told, and they desire to have them excluded.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And they are not now subject to be libeled?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No; that is not the intention. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 12046, the second deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a minute? I want to ask the gentleman if he would not, out of deference to Members on this side of the House, please let that go over until Monday the first thing? It will not lose any particular time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for support of the Government. It is only a partial report and it has to go back again into conference, I presume. The conferees feel that the report ought to be submitted to both Houses at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. CALDWELL. But the gentleman knows that the Democratic Party in New York State is just having a convention at Albany, which is quite some distance from here, and there are certain Members on this side of the House prominently identified with Democratic matters—

Mr. GOOD. A few.

Mr. CALDWELL. And I think it is only a matter of courtesy to grant delay, and I ask it. Of course, if the Republicans have no courtesy at all to extend to Democrats, if they insist that while these men are away they will take advantage of them, there is not anything we can do; but I ask the gentleman in a spirit of fairness to do this. Never when the Democrats were in power in this House did we take advantage of any considerable number of Republicans being away at a State convention.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is no intention of taking advantage of anyone.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then, if there is no intention of taking advantage of Members who are away attending a State convention, let the matter go over until Monday, in order that they may be here.

Mr. GOOD. If we waited until every Member of the House could be here, we would not have action on a conference report at all. I can not agree. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that; and in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not do that. There are more Democrats on the floor now than Republicans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no right to make such a statement.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And it is not true, anyhow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Apparently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves a call of the House.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Bacharach	Drane	Kennedy, Iowa.	O'Connell
Bell	Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Paige
Blackmon	Echols	Kless	Pell
Booher	Ellsworth	Kraus	Phelan
Bowers	Emerson	Kreider	Purnell
Browning	Ferris	Lampert	Radcliffe
Butler	Fess	Langley	Reber
Campbell, Pa.	Fields	Lankford	Reed, W. Va.
Caraway	Flood	Larsen	Riddick
Carew	Fuller, Mass.	Layton	Riordan
Clark, Fla.	Gallivan	Leshner	Robison, Ky.
Classon	Goldfogle	Lufkin	Rodenberg
Cooper	Goodall	Luhling	Rose
Copley	Goodykoontz	McCulloch	Rowan
Costello	Gould	McDuffie	Rubey
Crago	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Rucker
Cramton	Griest	Major	Saunders, Va.
Crowther	Hamill	Mann, S. C.	Schall
Currie, Mich.	Hudspeth	Montague	Scully
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Moore, Ind.	Sears
Dewalt	Jeffers	Morin	Sells
Dominick	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely	Slemp
Doelling	Kelley, Mich.	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, Ill.
Doughton	Kendall	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, N. Y.

Snell
Snyder
Stecgall

Steele
Stoll
Strong, Pa.

Sullivan
Swope
Taylor, Tenn.

Temple
Venable
Yates

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the conference report be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report. The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 54, 57, 58, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 65, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended as follows: At the end of the matter restored insert the following:

"An itemized statement of the articles transferred hereunder and the cost price thereof shall be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the salary of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Finland at the rate of \$10,000 per annum from March 1 to June 30, 1920, inclusive, \$3,333.33."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE.

"Not exceeding \$500,000 of the appropriation of \$3,500,000 for the care and custody of the draft records and for the employment of clerical assistance for the purpose of furnishing to adjutants general of States statements of service of soldiers who served in the War with Germany shall be available for the employment of clerical assistance necessary for the purpose of furnishing such information from the records of the demobilized army as may be properly furnished to public officials, former soldiers, and other persons entitled to receive it: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall reallocate the appropriation of \$4,000,000 for temporary employees in the War Department

in such manner as will provide an allotment of \$174,000 for the office of The Adjutant General in addition to the allotments already made for that office for the current fiscal year for work in connection with records of the demobilized army."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That in case said bridge is thrown open for public use one-half the cost of the maintenance thereof shall be paid by local interests"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$6,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000"; and add at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment the following: "*Provided further*, That the construction work hereunder shall be done by contract, let to the lowest responsible bidder, and no bid shall be accepted for any building to cost in excess of \$2.45 per square foot for an unlined building or \$2.90 for a lined building"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Norfolk, Virginia, Navy Yard: For dry dock and accessories, exclusive of any profit to the contractor, \$451,047.30."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 22, and 34.

JAMES W. GOOD,

J. G. CANNON,

JAMES F. BYRNES,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,

CHARLES CURTIS,

O. W. UNDERWOOD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Bureau of Efficiency.

On Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to the Council of National Defense: Strikes out the authority for the purchase of books, newspapers, and periodicals; strikes out the authority for the expenses of the advisory commission or subordinate bodies; appropriates \$45,000 instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate and \$50,000 as proposed by the House; and limits the highest salary to be paid from the appropriation to \$6,000 instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 6, 7, and 8, relating to the public schools of the District of Columbia: Appropriates for additional teachers from March 1 to June 30, 1920, as proposed by the Senate, instead of from February 1 to June 30, 1920, as proposed by the House, and inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate,

authorizing the payment to employees of the night schools from February 16, 1920, to the date of approval of the act.

On Nos. 9 and 10, relating to vocational rehabilitation of soldiers, sailors, and marines: Appropriates \$11,000,000 instead of \$12,000,000, as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restores the paragraph, stricken out by the Senate, relating to the transfer of equipment from the War Department to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, modified so as to require the Secretary of War to report to Congress an itemized statement of the articles transferred under the authority granted.

On No. 11: Appropriates for the salary of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Finland from March 1 to June 30, 1920, inclusive.

On Nos. 12 and 13: Appropriates for additional employees in the office of the Coast Guard from March 1 to June 30, 1920, inclusive, as proposed by the Senate, instead of from February 1 to June 30, 1920, as proposed by the House.

On No. 14: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard to purchase quartermaster supplies from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps at the same price charged officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

On No. 15: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for the enforcement of the national prohibition act by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the manner proposed by the Senate instead of in the manner proposed by the House.

On No. 16: Appropriates \$20,000 for a new roof on the mint building at Philadelphia, as proposed by the House, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 17: The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the appropriation of \$1,000,000, inserted by the Senate, to enable the Customs Service to enforce the laws governing the importation and exportation of intoxicating liquors.

On Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, relating to the Public Health Service: Appropriates \$3,500,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the care of war-risk insurance patients and other beneficiaries; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing officers of the Public Health Service to purchase quartermaster supplies from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, crediting officers of the Public Health Service with service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in computing longevity pay; and appropriates \$100,000, instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the prevention of epidemic diseases. The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, increasing the limit of cost of the hospital building at Cook County, Ill., from \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000.

On No. 24: Appropriates \$620.42, as proposed by the Senate, for rent of buildings for the War Department for the fiscal year 1919.

On No. 25, relating to the Office of The Adjutant General: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, making the appropriation "for the care and custody of draft records and the furnishing of statements of service of soldiers to the adjutants general of States" available for the furnishing of other information from the records of the demobilized Army, modified so as to limit such expenditures to not to exceed \$500,000 and also to require the Secretary of War to reallocate the current appropriation of \$4,000,000 for temporary employees in the War Department in such a manner as to give to the office of The Adjutant General an additional sum of \$174,000.

On No. 26: Appropriates \$956.63, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of damage claims in connection with river and harbor work.

On Nos. 27, 28, and 29, relating to the Signal Service of the Army: Inserts a reappropriation of \$300,000, instead of a reappropriation of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for telegraph and telephone systems, and inserts the reappropriation of \$95,000 for the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system.

On No. 30: Appropriates \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., modified so as to provide that local authorities shall pay one-half the cost of the maintenance of the bridge in the event it is opened up to public traffic.

On No. 31: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing an expenditure from previous ordinance appropriations for the construction of storage facilities for ammunition and other explosives, modified so as to limit the expenditure to \$5,000,000, instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate,

and also further modified so as to require the construction work thereunder to be done by contract let to the lowest responsible bidder and to limit the cost of any unlined building to \$2.45 per square foot and any lined building to \$2.90 per square foot.

On Nos. 32, 33, and 34, relating to the Naval Establishment: Appropriates \$451,047.30 for the dry dock at Norfolk, Va., and provides that the appropriation shall be exclusive of any profit to the contractor; appropriates \$128,260.60 for expenditures incident to the cost of a dry dock at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the appropriation of \$3,000,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of a dam to protect a bridge over the Elk Fork of the Shoshone River on the Cody approach to the Yellowstone National Park.

On Nos. 36 and 37: Appropriates for additional employees in the Patent Office from March 1 to June 30, 1920, as proposed by the Senate, instead of from February 1 to June 30, 1920, as proposed by the House.

On No. 38: Appropriates \$8,000, instead of \$10,000 as proposed by the Senate, for repairs to the power plant in the old Land Office Building.

On Nos. 39 and 40, relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital: Authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, the accounting officers of the Treasury Department hereafter to credit the accounts of the disbursing clerk with such amounts as he may pay in carrying out the provisions of the current sundry civil act relating to the readjustment of salaries at the hospital; and inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make regulations governing the disposal of articles produced by patients in the course of their treatment.

On Nos. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46, relating to the Department of Justice: Appropriates \$5,000 for miscellaneous expenses and \$5,000 for stationery, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,500, instead of \$5,000 as proposed by the Senate, for furniture and repairs; inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, making \$75,000 of the appropriation for detection and prosecution of crime available for the compensation of employees of the District of Columbia; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, making the current appropriations for salaries of district judges available for the salaries of all district judges lawfully entitled to compensation during the current fiscal year.

On No. 47: Appropriates \$20,500, as proposed by the Senate, for alterations to vessels transferred from the Navy Department to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

On Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54, relating to the Senate: Inserts appropriations as follows: Seven thousand five hundred dollars to pay the heirs of Thomas S. Martin, late a Senator from the State of Virginia; \$3,000 for a motor passenger vehicle for official use of the office of the Secretary of the Senate; \$5,000 for a motor vehicle for carrying the mails and for official use of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate; \$1,000 for fuel; \$4,966.79 for Senate kitchens and restaurants; and strikes out the appropriation of \$2,500 for securing plans for the construction of an additional section to the Senate Office Building.

On Nos. 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59, relating to the Government Printing Office: Appropriates \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House, for materials and labor for public printing and public binding; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the printing of enrolled bills and resolutions on parchment or paper of suitable quality as the Joint Committee on Printing may determine; appropriates \$25,000 for printing and binding for the Interior Department as proposed by the House, instead of \$15,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$50,000 for printing and binding for the Department of Labor as proposed by the House, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the House, for printing and binding for the Treasury Department, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 60, 61, 62, and 63: Appropriates for judgments of the Court of Claims certified to Congress as required by law, after the bill had passed the House.

On Nos. 64 and 65: Reduces the amount for the payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers from \$25,665.15 to \$20,917.51, as proposed by the Senate.

JAMES W. GOOD,

J. G. CANNON,

JAMES F. BYRNES,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is one item in the conference report that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] desires to make some inquiry about and desires some time upon. It is in regard to a matter at Fort Leavenworth. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, there is an item in the conference report covering a provision inserted in the bill by the Senate to purchase a bridge across the Missouri River in order to connect two bodies of the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth. The purpose of it is to provide access to a thousand acres of land owned by the Government on the Missouri side, which land they desire for agricultural and military purposes, and which is absolutely useless to the Government unless they acquire possession of the old bridge. This bridge was taken charge of by the War Department under the war power, and this provision, inserted by the Senate, of \$35,000 to complete the purchase of the bridge expedites the settlement of the claims the owners of the bridge have against the War Department, and for which they will ultimately be paid. But the conferees on the part of the House have inserted what I deem to be a very harmful proviso. They provide in case this certain bridge is thrown open for public use that one-half of the cost of the maintenance thereof shall be paid by local interests.

Mr. CALDWELL. What amendment is that?

Mr. ANTHONY. Senate amendment No. 30.

The situation is that there are a number of bridges either built or operated by the War Department across various streams over the country near military posts where the public has free use of the bridges, and if such a restrictive proviso is put upon this bridge at Fort Leavenworth it should apply equally to every bridge operated by the War Department where the public has the free use thereof, and not impose a burden upon that one community.

It is true that the proposition for the Government to operate this bridge is being fought by a railroad—the Chicago Great Western—which owns a bridge 3 miles to the south, and which thinks its wagon tolls may be impaired by the Government operation of this bridge 3 miles from it. Now, if the desire of the committee is to protect the railroad company, they have undoubtedly accomplished their purpose with this proviso. The president of that railroad company, Mr. Felton, was a member of the Council of National Defense here during the war, and through his influence the use of that 1,000 acres of land in Missouri, which was desired by the War Department, was handicapped all during the war through the selfish idea of protecting the railroad company. And therefore I believe the conferees should not accept the amendment of the Senate in that respect.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me some time? I want to talk about that subject and, incidentally, to pay my respect to the gentleman in charge of the bill. I do not want to camouflage the proposition at all.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs visited Fort Leavenworth, Kans., a few weeks ago, and while there examined this bridge; and I heartily concur in everything that the gentleman from Kansas has said. This, in my opinion, is one of the outrageous things that sometimes happen in this House. The proposition as it appears now in this conference report was reported by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, that had charge of this bill, to this House; and it being in the shape that it was in, and being legislation upon an appropriation measure, I took occasion to make a point of order against it. The gentleman from Kansas, in whose district this bridge is located, agreed that that was the only fair and right thing to do from a legislative point of view, and the best thing for the Government; that it should be taken out of the bill rather than to have it put in in that way. The bill then went over to the Senate, and in the Senate they appropriated the money to pay for the bridge; and, as I understand it, the conferees have written this proviso in the bill that was knocked out here. The gentlemen now seek to force upon this House legislation that they do not know anything about and can not find out anything about. They try to tie up the Government and take away from the Committee on Military Affairs the power to legislate upon this subject that is inherently and necessarily a duty of that committee.

In a few days we will begin hearings upon the military appropriation bill, and it is there that this item ought to be considered. What does this Committee on Appropriations know about the reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.? What does it know about the school that is there, or the farm that is

there, or anything else there? Have they visited it? Do they know anything about it except what somebody, with a purely personal interest in it, has to say to them? Have they made an inquiry about it? Is this House going to permit a subcommittee of two or three men to sit over there and listen to one side of that case—a Republican committee—and write into the bill a provision which a Republican Member from that district says is not fair to the Government or the people? Are you going to permit that to be done by the gentleman who shows such courtesy to the Democrats in this House in calling up this matter to-day, when the Democrats who are interested in this particular legislation are attending a Democratic convention and are unable to get here, and who wants to force a vote to-day in order that he can defeat a provision in this bill put in there by a Republican Senate? He does not agree it is the right thing to do. I want to say, gentlemen, that you can stand for that kind of legislation if you want to do so.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 56, which is agreed to by the conference report, provides that "hereafter enrolled bills and resolutions of either House of Congress shall be printed on parchment or paper of suitable quality, as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing." Does the gentleman from Iowa happen to know—probably it was not a very important matter in conference—why this change is proposed and what change is proposed?

Mr. GOOD. The reason given to the conferees that appealed to them was this, that at the present time parchment paper is very scarce and very, very expensive; that, through processes of manufacturing linen and bond paper, a paper almost if not equally good can be procured at less than one-half the cost of parchment paper; that the Joint Committee on Printing had thoroughly investigated the matter, and that they recommended this legislation; that the paper would be just as good for all practical purposes as parchment paper, and would result in the saving of about one-half of the cost of the parchment paper.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, that is a statement made to the House conferees. I do not wonder that they agreed to the proposition. But the statement is not true. To say that you can buy paper just as good for half price is all nonsense to begin with. The enrolled bills passed by Congress are laid away forever, or sooner, in the State Department. They ought to be preserved on the best quality of paper. That is parchment paper.

Now, the shortage in parchment paper is not like the shortage in print paper and newsprint paper and has nothing to do with it, and in the eagerness of a distinguished Member of another body, whom I have complimented often, to save a little money in printing, he proposes to cut out the use of parchment paper to keep documents which ought to last forever, and substitute some paper which will cost one-half as much and which will not last half as long. I think it is a great mistake.

Mr. GOOD. I assume that that will not be done unless a paper equally good at practically half the cost, as was represented to the conferees, would be the result of this legislation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no doubt that some manufacturer who manufactures it will say that it is equally as good, but anybody who knows anything about parchment paper and other papers knows that you can not make any other paper equivalent to parchment paper. If you could make another paper for half the cost equally good there would be no parchment paper made.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. The statement was made to the Committee on Printing, I think by the Public Printer, that suitable paper could be purchased for this purpose at about half the price, and that the paper would be just as good. The statement was also made that when a bill was put on parchment it could be erased, but if a superior grade of paper were used as a substitute they could get paper that could not be erased. For that reason the Committee on Printing was in favor of allowing the bill to be amended, so that it would not be necessary to use parchment in printing the bills.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In reference to amendment No. 9, regarding the appropriation for the Federal Board for Vocational Education, I notice the report shows that the House conferees agreed to a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the amount originally carried in the House bill. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: What facts were presented by the Senate conferees to

induce the House conferees to reduce the appropriation \$1,000,000 for that fund?

Mr. GOOD. They did not present very many facts. They simply made a reduction of \$2,000,000, and the amendment was one that provoked considerable discussion before the conferees, the Senate holding that the amount carried in the House bill of \$12,000,000 was too large and would not be necessary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did they give any reasons for that?

Mr. GOOD. No; they did not. They seemed to feel that the estimates made by the director and officers of the Vocational Board in regard to the increase in the number of men who would ask for training was overestimated and that they would not need the \$12,000,000. The House conferees still feel that if this service grows, as there is every indication that it will grow, the amount carried by the House bill would not any more than take care of the service, and that in fact we would be likely to be compelled to make the item in the sundry civil bill for the next fiscal year immediately available in order to take care of some of the bills that might be contracted this year. The conferees of the House stood out for this full amount, and the Senate conferees were just as confident that they would not spend more than \$10,000,000 as the House conferees were that they would require \$12,000,000, and the best we could do was to split the difference with them, and we brought it back with \$11,000,000 as the amount carried.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That, as the gentleman well knows, is very far below the amount as estimated by the board to be required.

Mr. GOOD. The estimate was \$15,000,000. I agree with the gentleman that the full amount carried in the House bill should have been allowed, but we were compelled to come to an agreement, and we did the very best we could in the matter of this appropriation, and whatever is necessary will have to be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In what bill?

Mr. GOOD. What is not carried in this bill will have to be taken care of in some other bill. That is evident, as the gentleman very well knows.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question in regard to the Vocational Board?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Amendment 10, stricken out by the Senate, has been restored, I find, by the conferees with an added proviso. I heartily approve of the restoration of that, but I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why it was not possible to reach an agreement looking to the adoption of the proposition submitted by the Vocational Rehabilitation Board so that the surplus machine tools hereafter declared as surplus could also be used by the Vocational Board?

Mr. GOOD. That matter was brought up. I remembered the gentleman's interest in the matter and suggested it to the conferees, but the position of the Senate conferees was that this item ought not to be carried at all, and that any enlargement of it would be subject to a point of order. The only thing to do in conference was either to agree or disagree to Senate amendment numbered 11. They were opposed to agreeing to this limited power, and expressed still greater opposition to an agreement whereby we would enlarge the power of the War Department to turn over machines and tools. It was our desire if possible to have shop machines and tools, in addition to those under the control of the Vocational Board, that belonged to the War Department turned over to the board when needed; but the Senate conferees would not agree to that.

Mr. TREADWAY. In other words, we have simply to abide by a wrong decision of the Senate. That appears to be the state of affairs.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that when we go into conference we can not always have our own way.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman permit me to say in that connection that since this item has been before the House it has been necessary for the Vocational Board to go into the open market and endeavor to buy these very tools for the rehabilitation schools which might have been supplied by the War Department?

Mr. GOOD. If they are surplus tools and machines, the War Department has the power to sell all surplus machines and tools, and the board would be compelled to buy from the War Department and could not buy in the open market if the War Department had a surplus of these very tools and machines. That is the law.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to know that is the law; but it is practically taking money out of one pocket in Uncle Sam's trousers and putting it into another pocket to make a better accounting and a better showing for the War Department.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Still it keeps some account of what is being done with the vast amount of stores acquired by the War Department during the war.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is quite sure that is the law, is he?

Mr. GOOD. There is no question about that.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. On page 7, at the bottom of the page, is what appears to be a Senate amendment granting an appropriation of \$3,000 for a motor passenger vehicle for official use of the Secretary of the Senate. Then there is an additional \$5,000 for motor vehicles for carrying the mails for official use.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I tried to get a resolution passed permitting the soldiers when in search of work to travel on the railways of this country for 1 cent a mile. I have been unable to get that resolution out of the committee on the ground that we can not afford it. Now, if we can not afford to let the soldiers travel for 1 cent a mile, how can we afford to give a \$3,000 passenger vehicle to the Secretary of the Senate and at the same time give him vehicles for the transportation of whatever rough work he may have to handle? Here are two passenger vehicles, one for the Secretary of the Senate and one for the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. I do not think that the Clerk of the House has any passenger vehicle furnished him by the House to ride around in, and I do not see why the Secretary of the Senate should have one. If the chairman of the committee has any explanation of that, I should like to hear what it is.

Mr. GOOD. Answering the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL], I will say that these are Senate items. I do not believe that the Secretary of the Senate ought to have a passenger vehicle at Government expense at all. The Clerk of the House does not have one, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House does not have one supplied at Government expense. But an unwritten law has obtained for a century that when the House puts on an item for the benefit of the House the Senate conferees do not attempt seriously to strike out that item where there is a disagreement, and when the Senate puts on an item of this kind the House conferees have very little to say. The Senate conferees will not listen to any dispute or controversy about it. Senate amendment No. 54 carried an appropriation of \$2,500 for the securing of plans and specifications for an addition to the Senate Office Building. The House conferees contended that that was altogether different than an appropriation for clerk hire or for automobiles or for contingent expenses; that it might involve the expenditure of millions of dollars in a building project not authorized by law. After a great deal of discussion we were able to have the Senate conferees agree that that item should go out, and the Senate receded. But this item is in a different class.

Mr. JUUL. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman—

Mr. GOOD. It does not embarrass me at all.

Mr. JUUL. I am in earnest about this.

Mr. GOOD. So am I.

Mr. JUUL. Does it not seem to the gentleman that we should either give the gentleman who occupies the same official position in the House a motor vehicle to ride around in or else we should strike out the motor vehicle going to the Secretary of the Senate?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is a valuable Member of the House—

Mr. JUUL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. There is going to be a vacancy in the Senate from the State of Illinois in the forthcoming election, and the only way I can suggest by which the gentleman can accomplish what he desires with regard to economy in the Senate is either to be a candidate for the Senate and be elected to that body and bring about these reforms or else elect somebody who will carry out his idea, because in conference we can not get the Senate conferees even to listen to a proposition to surrender on such items as this. The Senate is not a very economical body, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JUUL. Then the gentleman means to tell me that we are compelled to vote for this item or vote against the entire report?

Mr. GOOD. We are practically compelled to do just as the Senate wishes about that item, in the same way that the Senate is compelled to agree to the House items of a similar character. The items are usually small.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MILLER. I notice on Senate amendment 34 the conferees are unable to agree on the appropriation for \$3,000,000 for the Bureau of Construction and Repair in the Navy.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. I imagine that whole matter will probably come up when we have disposed of the conference report under instructions. It is not in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the item referred to by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. This is really not a deficiency item at all. This was for the authority to buy a bridge where no authority exists under the law. The gentleman from Kansas should have brought in a bill through his committee authorizing the purchase of this bridge, and after that had become a law there would have been no question in regard to the appropriation.

Now, the facts are as stated practically by the gentleman from Kansas. I think there is a reason why we should acquire this bridge. The Secretary of War commanded it during the war; spent \$7,000 or \$8,000 in repair. The whole question may go into the court, and it was the thought of the conferees that possibly the Government might be compelled to pay more than the amount agreed upon. That entered into the conclusion. But the House will recall that this same question came before us in a conference report last session, and the conferees disagreed to it. This time we put in this provision: That after the bridge has been purchased and put in repair and is thrown open to the public, if it is thrown open to the public, the local authority shall contribute one-half to the maintenance of the bridge. I think that is eminently fair.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. KEARNS. Is that same rule applicable to every other bridge in the United States?

Mr. GOOD. I understand it is not, but it should be.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it applicable to any other bridge?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know whether it is or not. So far as the bridge is concerned, I have no knowledge about the bridge referred to by the gentleman from Kansas. The bridge at Rock Island is a double-deck bridge, partly used by the railroad and a wagon road beneath.

The principal travel on the bridge, so I am advised, is travel to and from the arsenal by men having business at the arsenal. There is a little bridge at St. Paul which the gentleman refers to that I know nothing about. I know this is a matter that the Committee on Military Affairs should legislate on, and the Committee on Appropriations never desired to assume jurisdiction of the matter. The gentleman from Kansas casts aspersions on the conferees, insinuating that we are in collusion with the officers of the Great Western Railroad. As far as I am concerned, no person, except the gentleman from Kansas, outside of the conferees has spoken to me about the bridge. My whole information in regard to it, outside of the conferees, has come from the gentleman from Kansas, and if the president of the Great Western road is interested in this matter he has manifested his interest in some other way and not through the House conferees.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. ANTHONY. I informed the gentleman that this proposition had been tied up over a year in the War Department through the influence of the president of the railroad company, by reason of his position on the Council for National Defense. He has blocked every step toward the acquisition of this property.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-three Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following-named Members failed to answer to their names:

Bacharach	Clark, Fla.	Doughton	Graham, Pa.
Bell	Classon	Echols	Griest
Blackmon	Cooper	Ellsworth	Hamill
Bland, Ind.	Copley	Emerson	Harrison
Boober	Costello	Ferris	Hoey
Bowers	Crago	Fess	Huddleston
Brand	Cramton	Fields	Hudspeth
Britten	Crisp	Flood	Hutchinson
Browne	Crowther	Fuller, Mass.	Jeffers
Browning	Currie, Mich.	Gallivan	Johnson, Miss.
Brumbaugh	Curry, Calif.	Godwin, N. C.	Johnston, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Dewalt	Goldfogle	Kendall
Caraway	Domnick	Goodall	Kennedy, Iowa
Carter	Dooling	Gould	Kennedy, R. I.

Kettner
Kless
Kreider
Langley
Larsen
Layton
Leshner
Little
Lufkin
Luhning
McCulloch
McDuffie
McFadden
Major
Mann, S. C.
Montague

Moon
Moore, Ohio
Moore, Ind.
Morin
Neely
Nicholls, S. C.
Nichols, Mich.
O'Connell
Paige
Pell
Phelan
Pou
Purnell
Radcliffe
Rayburn
Reber

Riordan
Robinson, N. C.
Robison, Ky.
Rodenberg
Rose
Rowan
Rucker
Saunders, Va.
Schall
Scully
Sears
Sells
Shreve
Slomp
Smith, Ill.
Smith, N. Y.

Snell
Snyder
Steagall
Steele
Stoll
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Swope
Venable
Watson
Winslow
Wright
Yates

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] has control of the time.

Mr. GOOD. For what purpose does the gentleman desire time?

Mr. JUUL. I want to have permission to speak for three minutes upon the subject of this bill and the fact that I do not think that I was treated very well—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I rose in my seat and requested the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to kindly grant me a few minutes time in which to discuss an item in this conference report. The item that I desire to discuss is an appropriation of \$3,000 for the passenger motor vehicle for the official use of the Secretary of the Senate. I want to know if the Clerk of the House had a similar vehicle, and was informed that he had not. Under the item for \$3,000 is another item for \$5,000 for maintaining and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for the official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Vehicles evidently do the rough work over there. I thought that the \$3,000 was out of order and unjust and should not have been appropriated out of the people's money.

In taking the matter up and standing in front of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman stated to me that I ought to go and have myself elected to the Senate, and then I could probably get an item like that stricken out. I think that was entirely uncalled for. If it was meant as sarcasm, it was in bad order; and if it was meant to wound me, it was uncalled for. I want to inform the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentlemen on this floor that I occupied for a number of years a similar position to the one that he occupies, in the senate of my State, and that I transacted business as the chairman of the committee on the judiciary for a State with over 6,000,000 people. I think a Member on this floor ought to be permitted to rise and discuss an item in this bill without being squelched and ridiculed by anybody. I resent it; I think it is unfair; I think it is uncalled for. If the gentleman thought when he said what he did say that it would embarrass me to sit in the Senate and that I would not be able to transact the business if I sat over there, he is entirely mistaken; and I want to add this, that there is not anybody back home in my State who thinks that I could not fill the position over there if elected to it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry if I said anything to hurt the feelings of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL]. Whatever I said was not so intended.

Now, with regard to this bridge at Leavenworth, Kans., we have on the Missouri side of the river 1,000 acres of land, and the penitentiary is on the Kansas side. The item is not properly a deficiency; it is not an appropriation that is authorized by law; and the only provision that we add is that if the bridge is thrown open for public use one-half the cost of the maintenance thereof shall be paid by local interests. There ought to have been legislation. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and there ought to have been legislation from that committee with regard to this matter. It is obvious to the committee that so far as the use of the bridge by the Government is concerned, it would be almost negligible as compared with the use the public would put the bridge to. It is also shown that if abutments were put to the bridge, made of concrete, it would cost almost \$100,000. There is very little standing there now, except the braces and the girders. Some work, about \$7,000 worth, has been put on the bridge, and the bridge has been condemned

as an obstruction to navigation by the War Department. In view of all these facts, if this bridge is to be used by the public, as we are informed it will be, and as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] admits it will be used, then the public ought to contribute at least one-half of the expense. If the Government is to go out and build bridges here and there free of expense on the part of the local authorities, that is one proposition, but we place the provision in this amendment to protect the Treasury of the United States. If it does an injustice to that locality, the Committee on Military Affairs to-morrow can bring in a bill to repeal the provision.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. TINCER. Was the statement made by my colleague that the Government has bridges of this character in other places and that no such provision has been placed upon them as in this bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that statement was made.

Mr. TINCER. And I suppose the only difference is that this is in Kansas and not in some other State.

Mr. GOOD. The use that will be made by the Government of this bridge is negligible.

Mr. CALDWELL. The bridge on the Kansas side is on Government property?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. The bridge on the Missouri side is on Government property?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. And there is no road running to it which the Government uses?

Mr. GOOD. I am advised by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] that it is intended to throw it open to the public.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman has not been there and seen this?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. CALDWELL. And the gentleman knows that a subcommittee of seven members of the Military Committee were there and did examine it?

Mr. GOOD. Then the Military Affairs Committee ought to bring in legislation. That is the point that I am trying to make, that it is a matter for legislation.

Mr. CALDWELL. By what rhyme or reason does the Committee on Appropriations undertake to legislate for the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If there is no road leading to this bridge on either side, what was the use of the bridge there?

Mr. CALDWELL. There are 1,000 acres of land on the Missouri side, and we have 1,000 men in prison on the Kansas side who need that kind of work, and if we could get that bridge, so that they could go back and forth, it would be very beneficial.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is for the future. What was the use of the bridge in the past?

Mr. CALDWELL. It was a railroad bridge, used exclusively by the railroad, and it burned.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, ordering the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. VARE. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VARE. Does that prohibit debate on the other three sections?

Mr. GOOD. No; that will come after the conference report is disposed of.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 31, answered "present" 5, not voting 131, as follows:

YEAS—261.

Ackerman	Andrews, Nebr.	Baer	Begg
Almon	Ashbrook	Barbour	Benham
Anderson	Aswell	Barkley	Benson
Andrews, Md.	Babka	Bee	Black

Bland, Va.
Blanton
Box
Brand
Briggs
Britten
Brooks, Ill.
Browne
Buchanan
Burdick
Burke
Burroughs
Butler
Byrnes, S. C.
Byrnes, Tenn.
Candler
Cannon
Cantrill
Carss
Casey
Chindblom
Christopherson
Clark, Mo.
Coady
Cole
Collier
Connally
Darrow
Davey
Davis, Tenn.
Dempsey
Denison
Dickinson, Mo.
Dickinson, Iowa
Doremus
Dowell
Drane
Dunbar
Dunn
Dupré
Dyer
Eagan
Eagle
Edmonds
Elliott
Elston
Esch
Evans, Mont.
Evans, Nebr.
Evans, Nev.
Fairfield
Fisher
Focht
Fordney
Foster
Freeman
French
Fuller, Ill.
Gandy
Gard
Garland
Garner

Anthony
Ayres
Bland, Mo.
Caldwell
Carew
Cleary
Cullen
Dallinger

Bankhead
Goodykoontz

Bacharach
Bell
Blackmon
Bland, Ind.
Boles
Booher
Bowers
Brinson
Brooks, Pa.
Browning
Brumbaugh
Campbell, Kans.
Campbell, Pa.
Caraway
Carter
Clark, Fla.
Classon
Cooper
Copley
Costello
Crago
Cramton
Crisp
Crowther
Currie, Mich.
Curry, Calif.
Dale
Davis, Minn.
Dent
Dewalt
Domlnick
Dooling
Doughton

Garrett
Good
Goodwin, Ark.
Graham, Ill.
Green, Iowa
Hadley
Hamilton
Hardy, Colo.
Hardy, Tex.
Harrell
Hastings
Hawley
Hayden
Hays
Heilin
Hernandez
Hersey
Hersman
Hickey
Hicks
Hill
Holland
Houghton
Huddleston
Hullings
Hull, Tenn.
Humphreys
Husted
Igoe
Ireland
Jacoway
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Jones, Pa.
Juul
Kahn
Keller
Kelley, Mich.
Kelly, Pa.
Kettner
Kincheloe
King
Kitchin
Klecicka
Kraus
Lampert
Lanham
Lankford
Lazaro
Lea, Calif.
Leibach
Linthicum
Lonergan
Longworth
Luce
McAndrews
McArthur
McClintic
McGlennon
McKenzie
McKeown
McKinley

Donovan
Gallagher
Ganly
Goldfogle
Griffin
Hoch
James
Johnson, Ky.

Knutson

Echols
Ellsworth
Emerson
Ferris
Fess
Fields
Flood
Fear
Fuller, Mass.
Gallivan
Glynn
Godwin, N. C.
Goodall
Gould
Graham, Pa.
Greene, Mass.
Greene, Vt.
Griest
Hamill
Harrison
Haugen
Hoev
Howard
Hudspeth
Hull, Iowa
Hutchinson
Jefferis
Johnson, Miss.
Johnston, N. Y.
Jones, Tex.
Kendall
Kennedy, Iowa
Kennedy, R. I.

McLane
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLaughlin, Nebr.
McPherson
MacGregor
Madden
Magee
Mann, Ill.
Mapes
Martin
Mason
Mays
Merritt
Michener
Minahan, N. J.
Monahan, Wis.
Mondell
Moon
Moore, Va.
Morgan
Mott
Mudd
Murphy
Nelson, Mo.
Nelson, Wis.
Newton, Minn.
Newton, Mo.
Ogden
Oldfield
Oliver
Olney
Osborne
Overstreet
Padgett
Park
Parrish
Peters
Platt
Porter
Pou
Quin
Rainey, Ala.
Rainey, H. T.
Rainey, J. W.
Raker
Ramsey
Ramseyer
Randall, Calif.
Randall, Wis.
Rayburn
Reed, W. Va.
Rhodes
Ricketts
Riddick
Robinson, N. C.
Rogers
Romjue
Rouse
Rowe
Rubey
Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, La.

NAYS—31.

Kearns
Kinkaid
McKinley
MacCrate
Maher
Mead
Miller
Mooney

Reed, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—131.

Kiess
Kreider
Langley
Larsen
Layton
Lee, Ga.
Leshner
Little
Lufkin
Luhling
McCulloch
McDuffie
McFadden
Major
Mann, S. C.
Mansfield
Montague
Moore, Ohio
Moore, Ind.
Morin
Neely
Nichols, S. C.
Nichols, Mich.
O'Connell
Parker
Phelan
Purnell
Radcliffe
Reavis
Reber
Riordan

Sanders, N. Y.
Sanford
Scott
Sherwood
Siegel
Sims
Sinclair
Sinnott
Sisson
Small
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Mich.
Smithwick
Stedman
Steenerson
Stephens, Ohio
Stevenson
Stiness
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Sweet
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Tenn.
Thompson
Tillman
Tilson
Timberlake
Tinkham
Towner
Treadway
Upshaw
Vale
Vare
Vestal
Vinson
Voigt
Volstead
Walsh
Walters
Wason
Watkins
Weaver
Webster
Welling
Welty
Wheeler
White, Me.
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Pa.
Wingo
Winslow
Wise
Wood, Ind.
Woods, Va.
Yates
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.
Zihlman

Nolan
O'Connor
Sabath
Strong, Kans.
Tinchier
White, Kans.
Williams

Tague

Robison, Ky.
Rosenberg
Rose
Rowan
Rucker
Saunders, Va.
Schall
Scully
Sears
Sells
Shreve
Slomp
Smith, Ill.
Smith, N. Y.
Snell
Snyder
Steagall
Steele
Stephens, Miss.
Stoll
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Swope
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Thomas
Venable
Ward
Watson
Whaley
Woodyard
Wright

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. BOIES with Mr. SEARS.
Mr. PURNELL with Mr. CRISP.
Mr. BROWNING with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. MAJOR.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. WRIGHT.
Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.
Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. BEE.
Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. PELL.
Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. VENABLE.
Mr. SLEMP with Mr. BLACKMON.
Mr. KREIDER with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.
Mr. LUHRING with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. SNELL with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. WHALEY.
Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. DENT.
Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. FESS with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. WATSON with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. CARTER.
Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. THOMAS.
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. KENDALL with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. STEAGALL.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. JONES of Texas.
Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. MANSFIELD.
Mr. SHREVE with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. FERRIS.
Mr. REBER with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. O'CONNELL.
Mr. CRAGO with Mr. McDUFFIE.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. REAVIS with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. LARSON.
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
Mr. FREAR with Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina.
Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. LESHER.
Mr. PARKER with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
Mr. ROSE with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. HOEY.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. DOMINICK.
Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. CARAWAY.
Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. BOOHER.
Mr. CLASSEN with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. BRINSON.
Mr. COOPER with Mr. STOLL.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present."

The name of Mr. TAGUE was again called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 17.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 17, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

For enforcing the laws governing the importation and exportation of intoxicating liquors by the Customs Service, \$1,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take only a minute on this amendment unless somebody makes a preferential motion to bring the matter more clearly before the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for information?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this an addition to the million dollars that the House provided for some time ago for the enforcement of the prohibition law?

Mr. GOOD. No; this is for another object altogether.

Mr. BLANTON. This is for a different, distinct, and separate object?

Mr. GOOD. This, it seems to me, has for its object the attempt to make prohibition wholly ridiculous.

Mr. BLANTON. And comes from the enemies of the prohibition law?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman supposes that?

Mr. GOOD. It comes from the Treasury Department. I do not know who is responsible for it. I will say to the gentleman that, broadly speaking, it is for the purpose of hiring 1,000 men to guard 3,000 miles of territory along the Canadian border and about 1,800 miles of territory along the Mexican border, so as to prevent persons in automobiles, on horseback, in wagons, or on foot from coming across the line and bringing liquor into the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. There is not that much mescal in Mexico.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know anything about that. It did seem to the committee that with the \$10,000,000 appropriated for collecting the customs, every dollar of the unexpended balance of which is available for this very purpose, to now appropriate \$1,000,000 more and employ a thousand men would be a waste of money. In the first place, if we are going to patrol all along the border we must erect a wall along that border. We must protect it with aeroplanes; we must protect it in every possible way if you are going to try to keep out the importation of liquor in that manner. It is absolutely ridiculous, and would make any man who votes for it as a business proposition, it seems to me, look ridiculous. [Applause.]

We are considering the same matter before the sundry civil subcommittee. We have gone into the matter at considerable length, and it did not seem to the subcommittee that heard the testimony that this proposition could really be asked for in good faith. If we are to employ these men at every crossroad, we ought to have three men at every crossroad. We must have three shifts a day, and that will be 3,000 men instead of 1,000. But if they are only going to try to guard the crossroads, how about the spaces between the crossroads? What will prevent an automobile, in that vast space, going across the prairie and bringing in liquor? It is absolutely ridiculous to appropriate a million dollars for this purpose for the rest of this year. I believe in the enforcement of the prohibition law. It ought to be given a fair chance. A man who votes for this, it seems to me, throws upon the enforcement of that law an obligation by which no man or set of men can bring about any degree of enforcement.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Is there any money available for this particular purpose?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. There was \$10,000,000 available for this year for all purposes of the Customs Service.

Mr. BOX. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to say that before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization it has been complained that a large number of men are coming across the Canadian and Mexican borders in violation of immigration laws. We have been asked to present a bill authorizing an appropriation to better guard the Mexican and Canadian borders against the illegal entry of aliens. I am wondering whether, if this legislation is going through, this work can not be coordinated with the work of the immigration authorities, so as to avoid a duplication?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know whether the bill will pass the House or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As a matter of fact, there is to be a great expenditure to protect the borders of the United States with guards, and a great effort is to be made to enforce the policies in regard to immigration, liquor, and other things.

Mr. CALDWELL. To vote "yea" on the motion of the gentleman to insist on the House position in this matter would mean to strike out the \$1,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. That is equivalent—

Mr. CALDWELL. A vote "yea," then, would on its face appear to be against the enforcement of prohibition also?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. It would be in favor of a proposition to prevent the waste of \$1,000,000 in a useless attempt to enforce this phase of the prohibition law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will not the gentleman agree it is useless to attempt to enforce prohibition anyhow?

Mr. GOOD. I do not agree to that, but I agree that this appropriation is useless.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 17.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am in accord with the chairman of the Appropriation Committee in opposing the appropriation of \$1,000,000 inserted in this bill by the Senate for the Customs Service. The Volstead Act appropriated \$2,000,000 to the revenue department for the enforcement of the prohibition law for the balance of this fiscal year. It appropriated \$100,000 to the Department of Justice for the same purpose for the balance of this fiscal year. This bill carries an additional sum of \$1,000,000 for the revenue department for the purpose of guarding warehouses and thus aiding in the enforcement of the prohibition law from now until July 1.

The Coast Guard came before the Appropriations Committee recently, and in asking for a greatly increased appropriation urged that the increase was necessary in order that they might send aeroplanes out to sea in order to detect small craft coming into the Florida coast with liquor from ports to the south, and also to operate off the Florida coast hundreds of small vessels which they intended to take over from the Navy. There is not a department of the Government, it seems, that now does not want to put its hands into the Treasury in order to enforce the prohibition law. I voted for the resolution submitting the constitutional amendment. I voted for the Volstead Act, but I am not willing to make the enforcement of that law ridiculous in the eyes of the people of the Nation by granting every request that comes for millions of dollars for its enforcement by every department of this Government.

The only argument made in behalf of this appropriation is that while the revenue department is to spend its money in enforcing the prohibition law in the interior, there is no appropriation to enable the Customs Service to stop the smuggling in of whisky at the ports and across the Canadian border and the Mexican border.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield. I have but a limited time. The representatives of the Customs Service have their agents at the ports now. They are supposed to inspect the property of the man who lands at those ports. If they inspect it for other reasons, they can determine whether or not he has a bottle of whisky in his grip; and as to the desirability of attempting to place an army along the Canadian border and the Mexican border, this sum of \$1,000,000 would be merely that much money thrown away, because every man knows that it would take a man to a mile, and you would have to have three shifts a day, and it would take \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 for the Canadian border alone. And why this law alone should be singled out as an excuse for building a wall around the United States and employing an army I do not know nor does any man in this House know; and as a friend of the law, wanting to see it enforced and not wanting to make it ridiculous, I oppose this appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman says it would take "an army." Would it not be desirable, if this attempt is to be made in this way, to use the Army? Would not that be the only way it could ever be done?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I agree that that is the only way it could be done.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the conference committee on this bill. I voted for the legislation that is upon the statute books. Let us look at it just a minute. One million dollars has been appropriated, as referred to, \$200,000 of which is for the detection of frauds. This is also available to the Treasury Department, and practically to protect the revenue it is available for the purpose referred to.

I do not know what disposition may be made of the request of the Coast Guard, with airplanes to assist. From Maine across the continent on our northern border it is 3,500 miles, and on the southern border it is in the neighborhood of 2,500 miles, as I recollect. On the east the United States has the Atlantic Ocean, and on the south the Gulf, and on the west the Pacific Ocean. If I thought that this \$1,000,000 was necessary for the enforcement of the law I would vote for it. [Applause.] I am in favor in good faith of enforcing the law, and it does not make any difference, it seems to me, what I thought about it heretofore. I voted for the legislation because the sentiment for a decade from the district which I have the honor to represent demanded the legislation, and I felt that the time had

come when I should either resign or voice the sentiment of my constituency.

Now, I agree that nothing short of the Army and Navy, including the Coast Guard and including a thorough policing of six or seven thousand miles of land on the boundaries between us and the country upon the south and the country upon the north, would be efficient in guarding our borders. With the amount of money that is now available for the balance of the fiscal year, in my judgment—and I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]—without regard to the \$1,000,000 additional to what has been devoted to the enforcement of the laws along this line, without regard to the loss of the million dollars, it seems to me that the enemies of the prohibition law desire to make it ridiculous by reason of the extraordinary expenditure, and therefore, perhaps, favor this appropriation. I may be wrong about it. I do not think I am. But I agreed with the conference committee on the part of the House to bring it back to the House and let the House pass upon it, and, by a preferential motion, if anybody sees fit to make it, to agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 211, noes 0.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the next Senate amendment relates to the hospital at Chicago, numbered 22. I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] desires to make a preferential motion.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I offer the following motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and agree to the same with the following substitute:

"To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out at once the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919, the limit of cost of the acquisition of the site and uncompleted building and completion and construction of the hospital buildings at Cook County, Ill., authorized by said act, is hereby increased from \$3,000,000 to \$3,400,000, and, for the purpose of carrying the foregoing authorization into effect, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of said sum so appropriated shall be used to pay any profit to either the owners of the land and present uncompleted buildings or to the contractor for the completion of the work."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I desire to offer a motion to concur with an amendment. I want to know if the gentleman from Iowa will allow me to offer that motion instead of moving the previous question?

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman desire to offer it now, so that it may be pending?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina offers a motion for the information of the House. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 22 with an amendment striking out all of the paragraph after the word "of," on line 25, page 15, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919; so much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes' (Public No. 5, Sixty-sixth Congress); and so much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the employees of the Compensation Commission and the Public Health Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920,' approved December 24, 1919, as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire and complete the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., known as the Speedway Hospital, is hereby repealed, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to construct in Cook County, Ill., on land now owned by the Government or on a new site to be acquired by purchase or otherwise, a hospital plant, complete, at a cost not exceeding \$3,000,000."

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. It is read for information only. It has not yet been offered.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] that it has been suggested that it might be better if the gentleman would offer his amendment now as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa, and I offer my amendment as a substitute, so that if the point of order is to be made it can be made at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assumes that the gentleman does not desire to have his amendment read again immediately, and the Chair will assume that he offers it as a substitute instead of for information.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve it.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. I will waive the point of order. I think we can determine the question on its merits. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I assume that the gentleman wants to use some time in the discussion of this proposition, and inasmuch as the time is limited to one hour I will ask the gentleman if it will be satisfactory to him if I yield him one-half of that time?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Entirely satisfactory.

Mr. GOOD. I yield first 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, almost two years ago the Shank Co. began to construct a building proposed to be used for a hospital under the Public Health Service for the care of wounded soldiers who have been discharged from the service.

The work on this hospital was not done under a formal contract, but it was done under an informal contract and by authority of the public officials of the Government.

Later on, about the 16th of October last year, it was suggested by the contractor that if the Secretary of the Treasury would sign the contract authorizing the completion of the work he would complete the work for \$3,000,000, and up to last December the contractor was ready to do that. The Secretary of the Treasury never was ready to sign a contract up to that time, although negotiations had been conducted from time to time looking to that end.

Later on the Secretary of the Treasury determined that he would sign a contract, and then it transpired that the cost of labor and material had risen so much higher than it was either in October or December, 1919, that it would be impossible for the contractor to proceed without great loss, and so the matter stands. When the question was up here a short time ago the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] wanted to know if anyone here could speak for those who were interested in the construction of this building and say for them that no additional appropriation would be requested or required. In response to that I said I was not authorized to speak, but that I was in favor of completing the work within the \$3,000,000 that was then appropriated. But it seems that now that is not possible. Everything within the power of man that could be done by the contractor and his associates has been suggested to the Treasury Department with a view to closing a contract that would furnish the facilities needed to care for these wounded soldiers, but no agreement has yet been reached. Even the suggestion has been made by the contractor and his associates to the effect that they would take back 240 of the 320 acres of land at the price which they were to be paid for the entire 320 acres of land, thus proposing to give to the Government of the United States for this purpose 80 acres of land without cost upon which to construct these buildings.

It has been suggested by these contractors, and agreed to, I believe, by the Secretary of the Treasury, that various deductions can be made without in any way affecting the adequacy of the buildings, amounting to about \$165,000, and proposals have been made to the effect that these men will now enter into a contract to construct the buildings called for by the plans and specifications of the Government at a cost not to exceed \$3,400,000, and that all the excess labor cost and material cost shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that under no circumstances will these contractors require any profit on any contract which they may enter into; that they will do the work without profit and at cost. Could anything be fairer than that? I think not.

Now, the proposal under the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina prevents the possibility of furnishing facilities for the care of these wounded discharged soldiers, because if we were to enact that into law we would simply

provide that the Secretary of the Treasury may build a hospital somewhere in Cook County to cost not to exceed \$3,000,000. What is the first thing he would have to do under that? He would have to provide the land. How long would that take? It would take not less than two years to find and buy the land. How long would it take to put up the buildings? Not less than one year more, consuming three years of time before we would supply facilities to care for the men who have been wounded in defense of the flag.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understood the substitute proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina to say that the new hospital should be erected on land now owned by the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. "Or purchased."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Government does not now own any land suitable for this purpose in Cook County.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government owns a piece of land where the Marine Hospital stands, on Racine Avenue on the north side, and that land is 540 feet long. There is a hospital standing upon that land to-day. It has facilities for 120 men, 120 beds. There are now 140 patients in that building. That hospital has been there since I was a small boy and long before. It is utterly inadequate. It is antiquated; it is unfit for human use. It should be torn down and something else erected in its place.

The Illinois Tuberculosis Association has just reported that there are 1,200 tubercular patients in Illinois alone now awaiting hospital facilities. There are no hospital facilities in Chicago or around it except this Marine Hospital with facilities for 120 men, and the Cooper Hospital, now located in a private building, the owner of which refuses to extend the lease. There are facilities in the Cooper Hospital for 400 patients and the place is overcrowded. It is insanitary. What are you going to do? Are you going to say that because of a difference of the measly sum of three or four hundred thousand dollars you are not going to provide for the care of the men who gave themselves to the defense of the flag in the time of its direst need?

The time has come when we must stop this dillydallying, the time is here when we must act and act quickly, and if we expect to furnish facilities for the care of these men there is only one way to do it, and that is to appropriate this money, sign the contract on the terms which have been agreed upon, proceed to the completion of the building where the men can be taken care of within the next 90 days.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to have the gentleman state for the benefit of the Members how much sooner these buildings can be completed than new ones built.

Mr. MADDEN. I have said that these buildings could be completed in 90 days and that it would take 3 years to complete new buildings which you have not yet started. So that we would have 2 years and 9 months advantage over the proposal covered by the gentleman's amendment. Here we have 320 acres of land, fertile as no land anywhere in the United States is, 250 acres of which can be used for the purpose of raising food supplies for the men who are to be provided for in the hospital.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. GALLAGHER. To erect new buildings, would it not cost double what these buildings have cost?

Mr. MADDEN. You could not put up buildings that would be half the size of these for anything like the money that is proposed to be appropriated. The only reason why you can complete these buildings for the amount indicated is that we have already built the most of them under normal conditions, and conditions at present are abnormal. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We will only have one speech on this side, and I presume the chairman wishes to close debate.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this is the same old hospital fight being gone over again. Instead of proceeding with the completion of the hospital, which is needed by the department, following out the precedents made by former Secretaries, the Secretary of the Treasury desires to go out and get more land and proceed to build another new hospital and delay the completion of necessary hospital facilities for the ex-service men of this country for two years. It is useless

to talk about it. The Secretary of the Treasury and his entire force have for some unknown reason been opposed to the completion of this hospital. Whether it is because of personal feeling against some one connected with it I do not know, but I do know that unless we adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] we are not going to get the thing that is absolutely necessary for the wounded soldiers of this country for two years. This appropriation has been inserted by the unanimous vote of the Senate without regard to politics or personal feeling, and there is no reason why the House should not agree with the Senate and have the hospital in operation in three or four months. If the House does not do it the membership is at fault, and if they do not do it they will deserve the censure of all men.

The House on March 3 a year ago appropriated the money for the hospital, knowing that we needed it, and we can not get action. Always they came back with some new plan of delay. I hope every Member will join with us to secure the hospital facilities which we so much need. [Applause.] A vote for the Cannon amendment will get action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would not speak at all were it not for the fact that I apprehend my beloved friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] might subsequently tell the House that I stated when this matter was up before that we would never ask for more than \$3,000,000. I do not remember whether that was the exact statement I made, but it was substantially so. These were the circumstances: The Treasury Department, not feeling authorized and for other reasons not desiring to sign the contract under the original provision, had asked Congress to appropriate two and a half million dollars more for the construction of additional buildings. It is true that at the time I understood that if we passed the item authorizing a contract within the limit of \$3,000,000 that would be sufficient to have these buildings completed. I stated then, and I state now, that as far as I am concerned I not only would not ask but I would be opposed to appropriating two and a half million dollars, or any part of it, toward the construction of this additional building which the Public Health Service was trying to get Congress to authorize. Of course, I do not know what may come in the far-distant future. I am not in favor of the plan proposed by the Public Health Service to provide not only a great hospital there, but buildings costing two and a half million dollars more for the use of nurses and physicians.

What is the proposition pending before us? Mr. Hines, through various circumstances, the main one of which was the loss of his son under very distressing conditions in France during the war, wanted to help the Government build a hospital for the use of the Government during the war. He proposed that he be allowed to do that to the extent that he would contribute a million or a million and a half dollars and the Government should contribute the balance, and at the end of the war he would get the buildings back and then have the hospital, which he proposed to donate as a memorial to Chicago or to Illinois, whatever the local municipality might be. If his contract goes through and the hospital is built, he will then have given to the Government in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars. He will be out a million and a half dollars. If the Government built a new hospital on ground already owned by the Government—although it does not own ground in Cook County, Ill., on which a hospital can be built—the Government would lose a million and a half dollars which Mr. Hines would otherwise contribute to the Government, and thereby reduce the size and the facilities of the hospital.

This matter has been before the House on a number of occasions. If we can now for \$3,000,000 or \$3,400,000 obtain a hospital which would cost five or five and a half million dollars to complete as a new proposition, are we not better off, will we not have better facilities than would be obtained by starting a new project and paying \$3,000,000 for a half-size hospital which can not be obtained for several years? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDELOM] each have five minutes on this subject, not to be taken out of the hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They are both in favor of this proposition, are they not?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but my time has already been yielded. I have agreed to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, and I have not any time to grant to these gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I will ask the Speaker now to recognize Mr. SABATH.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House are familiar with the former legislation on this proposition, and I shall not take time to go into it now. I am satisfied that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] protects the interests of our Government. There is no one here who will deny that the hospital is badly needed. The hospital is needed, and we owe it to these boys to provide them a proper place in case of sickness. It has been stated that there are eleven hundred service boys in need of hospital or medical attention who can not be taken care of at this time. Our hospitals are filled now. We have no place anywhere within miles of Chicago where we can take care of these sick and suffering boys. The substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] that the Government should build a hospital somewhere else is absolutely out of the question, and if the gentleman were acquainted with conditions in Chicago and in the vicinity of Chicago, from what I know of him I know that he would not have offered this substitute. The location that he referred to contains only a block and a half; it is in a crowded section, where thousands of automobiles pass every day. This great hospital, the Speedway, is 10 miles away from the courthouse. It is splendidly situated and will afford to these boys who need attention a splendid place to put in one, two, or three weeks when in need of medical treatment.

I do not know how much money Mr. Hines is donating to the Government. I do not know whether it is a million or a cent; but even if he is not donating a penny, our Government is rich enough and is in duty bound to provide for these boys. It will be a shame and a disgrace if we should delay another three or six months or another year, as we have already done. I do not know the reason behind this effort to prevent the erection and completion of this hospital. No one has charged that it is too expensive. It is fireproof; it can not be duplicated for the same price now, nor can the ground be obtained for the same price. As I understand the motion, it is to provide \$400,000 in addition to the \$3,000,000, although it may not require more than \$150,000 or \$200,000. If it is not used, it will go back into the Treasury. I think the motion of the gentleman from Illinois ought to prevail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina give him a minute in which to answer a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes, if the gentleman asks me to.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZARO. Gentlemen on both sides of the aisle speak of the cost, speak of dollars. What I am interested in is the element of time. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this hospital which has been started will be completed within three months and the other one in about three years?

Mr. SABATH. This hospital is under roof now. It is a building over 2,000 feet long, it is fireproof, and I believe it can be completed within 90 days. It would have been completed a year ago had it not been for a lot of technical questions that came up from time to time.

Mr. LAZARO. Another question: Have gentlemen on both sides of the aisle taken into consideration the fact that in order to cure tubercular patients you have got to start now, and if you wait a year or nine months it will be too late?

Mr. SABATH. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If they had purchased this hospital when it was offered first, they would have saved \$400,000.

Mr. SABATH. Why, we would have saved \$900,000. It is the same as with the Chicago post office. If we had acted when we should, we would have saved to the Government \$4,000,000; and if we do not act now, the chances are that we will be obliged and the public will demand that we appropriate instead of \$400,000 perhaps \$4,000,000 more. I do not agree with my

colleague [Mr. MANN], and I would not refuse to appropriate in the future any additional sum of money recommended by the department. On the contrary, I am ready and willing to appropriate any amount of money which is necessary to properly take care of the boys who have served our Nation. We can not do too much for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House and the country should know the situation with reference to the hospital facilities for the sick and disabled soldiers who have come out of the recent war. On December 5 last the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a communication, which, on December 8, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. This Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has held hearings for six or seven days upon a bill suggested by the ex-Secretary of the Treasury, now a Member of the Senate [Mr. GLASS]. Those hearings have brought out the great need for hospital facilities for the care of the soldiers, sailors, and marines who have returned from the war sick or disabled. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. GLASS, in the communication of December 5, 1919, stated to the Speaker of the House that there would be required during the next two years 30,600 beds for the care of these ex-service men, and that the total number of hospitals now operated by the Public Health Service provide 7,200 beds, leaving a balance of 23,400 beds to be provided within the next two years.

Representatives of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Public Health Service have appeared before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and asked for \$85,445,000, to be expended as follows: Fifteen million dollars for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; \$18,425,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for construction purposes, and, in addition, \$1,400,000 for 1920, \$2,200,000 for 1921, \$2,000,000 for 1922, and \$1,400,000 for 1923, for furniture and equipment, all for the purpose of providing accommodations for the care of discharged sick and disabled ex-service men from the late war.

Hearings before the committee show that none of the projects included in the act of March 3, 1919, have been advanced sufficiently to justify an expectation that they will be ready for use within the present year, with the single exception of the Broadview Hospital, at Chicago, which could have been completed within not to exceed four months at any time since March 3, 1919.

The owners and contractors for the Broadview Hospital would have completed the building within the limit of cost of \$3,000,000 if they had been permitted to begin work at any time prior to October 16, 1919. The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to take over the Broadview or Speedway Hospital by the act of March 3, 1919; thereafter he was directed to acquire the property on July 11, 1919, and again directed by Congress to close the matter on December 24, 1919. During all this time the cost of material and the scale of wages have constantly increased, and with the opening of the spring season at this time further large advances in both material and labor are inevitable. In fact, the labor unions belonging to the Building Trades Council in Chicago have already served notice of a demand for increased wages to take effect both on April 1 and May 1. The situation resulted in action being taken by the Associated Building Contractors of the State of Illinois at their third annual convention at Chicago on January 7 and 8 advising their members to protect themselves by inserting in every contract a provision that the proposition therein made is based upon the cost of material as of the date of the contract, and that the owners will be charged or credited with the increase or decrease in the cost of material and labor over or under the prices which existed upon the date of the contract. Similar action has been taken by the building interests throughout the United States.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is now confronted with the necessity of acting upon the communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, asking further authorization to procure hospital facilities. The situation is appalling. Everywhere throughout the country there are hundreds and

thousands of men who are waiting for hospital care and treatment, who are suffering disabilities and ailments and diseases contracted in the recent war. I do not apprehend that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is going to stand upon the queries which he propounded to some of us in a recent discussion of this matter, but if he does, I want to call attention to the question which was asked of me. It was then proposed by the Bureau of the Public Health Service and by the Secretary of the Treasury, not by Members of the House who advocated this proposition, that an additional appropriation of \$2,500,000 should be made for the purpose of enlarging not only the capacity but the scope and purpose of the Broadview Hospital. The gentleman from South Carolina, interrupting me at that time, said:

I want the gentleman to tell me in that one one word—

Which I was about to utter—

whether he is going to come back here and ask for the two and a half million dollars.

And, as the record shows, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] answered, "I am not." We are not here now asking for the two and a half million dollars; but, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: It is almost a year since the Secretary of the Treasury was first authorized to acquire this property or some other suitable property for the care of the sick and disabled ex-service men in the Middle West. He has done nothing yet. The buildings at Broadview could have been completed within four months at any time since the 3d of March, 1919. If there be any increased cost now, it has been caused by these repeated delays of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May I have one minute more?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we did have an agreement in which the time was fixed—

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I understood the request was that the time be extended outside of the time fixed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. Forty-three minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, is not that incorrect, because I understand we on this side are to have 30 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair included the 30 minutes which the gentleman from Iowa is going to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, and he has 13 minutes besides.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina. There will be but a combination speech on this side between the gentleman from Illinois and myself.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I understood the gentleman to have but one speech, but I have no objection to his having two.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I dislike very much again to discuss this question of the Speedway Hospital. I hoped that we had finished with it; but, like Banquo's ghost, it will not down. The Speedway Hospital has been before Congress for many months. The fact is that it originated as the result of the abandonment of what was known as the Speedway race track. Mr. Edward Hines, having started the construction of that enterprise, had upon his hands during the year 1918 an immense lot of steel girders and other material that had been purchased for the grandstand. It is difficult to know for what purpose they could be used other than in the construction of such a building as has been erected. I can only speculate as to what motive actuated him in commencing the construction of this building and in endeavoring to sell it to the War Department in the summer of 1918. The officers of the War Department at that time were exceedingly anxious to take over anything and everything that they could find that would serve the purpose of a hospital building, anticipating as they did that the war would continue for many months, if not years, to come. A subordinate officer approved the plans by putting his initials upon the plan of the hospital submitted to him by Mr. Hines and his representatives. Before it reached the Secretary of War or the Assistant Secretary of War for his approval, Mr. Hines proceeded with the construction of that building, and

finally telegraphed asking that the War Department secure priorities for the shipment of certain material necessary for the building of this hospital under contract with the War Department. The Secretary of War immediately telegraphed him that if he was under the impression that he had a contract with the War Department for the construction of the hospital that he was mistaken, and he was proceeding at his own risk. No contract was ever signed with Mr. Hines; and, notwithstanding the repeated statements upon this floor with reference to a contract had with the War Department, there never was a contract and there is no contract to-day.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I can not yield. I am going to state the history of this thing. Upon the cessation of hostilities November 11 it became apparent that the War Department had no use whatever for this immense hospital building. These gentlemen then went to the Public Health Service, and they were wise in doing it, because, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has so often stated on the floor, there is no department of the Government more anxious to branch out and extend its activities than the Public Health Service, and they were willing to take over the building, provided it could be adapted to the needs of the Public Health Service. Negotiations followed. Finally, on March 3, 1919, this Congress passed an act—I have it here—and I wish to read it to the House, because I want the House once and for all to understand this Speedway Hospital matter.

Gentlemen to-day tell you that on March 3 the Congress directed the Secretary of the Treasury to take over this hospital immediately and complete it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Has anybody said he was directed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have refused to yield.

In March, 1919, Congress passed an act providing that the hospital in Cook County, Ill., should be taken over, but the act contained this provision:

Provided, That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall make a finding that any hospital project hereinafter specifically authorized is not to the best interest of the Government from the standpoint of cost, location, and of the emergency needs of the Public Health Service he is hereby authorized to reject such project or projects and to locate, construct, or acquire hospitals at such other locations as would best subserve the interest of the Government and the emergency needs of the Public Health Service within the limits of cost of such authorization.

This act limited the expenditure to \$3,000,000. It was a discretionary act of Congress. It placed in the Secretary of the Treasury the discretionary authority to complete the Speedway Hospital, or, if he did not think it best served the interest of the Government, then to go elsewhere and construct a building. The Secretary of the Treasury, following out the mandate of the act of Congress that said he must investigate as to whether it would best serve the interests of the Government, caused the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Supervising Architect to come before him. The Supervising Architect submitted to him a memorandum telling him if he signed the contract which was referred to in this act that the Government would buy an extraordinary amount of trouble. Upon that recommendation of the Supervising Architect the Secretary of the Treasury proceeded to investigate. He submitted it to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, asking him to determine what the needs of the Public Health Service were, and when those needs were determined he submitted the matter to the Supervising Architect in order to ascertain whether it could be completed within the limit of cost. He had to do it to comply with the act of Congress that said this building must be suited to the needs of the Public Health Service and limited the cost to \$3,000,000. The Supervising Architect reported to him that in order to adapt that building to the needs of the Public Health Service it would cost \$2,500,000 in addition to the \$3,000,000 appropriated by Congress. The law officer of the Treasury Department advised the Secretary of the Treasury that he could not sign a contract exceeding \$3,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury then proceeded to exercise the discretion placed in him by this act, and investigated what is known as the marine hospital site. Plans were drawn—tentative plans are to-day in the Supervising Architect's office—for the construction of a hospital building on land owned by the Government, known as the marine hospital site.

At that time the gentlemen interested in the Speedway proposition heard what was in the mind of the Secretary of the Treasury. They knew he was considering the erection of a hospital on the marine hospital site instead of completing the Speedway Hospital. And then what happened? A deficiency bill went to the Senate. And here on the last night of that

session of Congress, prior to the next fiscal year, when the deficiency bill came back to the House it had on it a provision making it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to take over the Speedway Hospital and taking away from him the discretion he was about to exercise in favor of constructing a new building in Cook County, Ill. But the gentlemen who framed that amendment and put it on the deficiency bill in the Senate framed it so that it provided again that it was discretionary to the extent that the Secretary had to adapt it to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service. The Public Health Service immediately proceeded to frame its plans, and when the plans were submitted to the Supervising Architect he advised the Secretary that to complete the buildings in accordance with what the Public Health Service said was necessary to make it suit their needs would make it cost \$5,500,000. I was opposed to the Congress appropriating \$5,500,000 for this hospital. In December we sent to the Senate a bill providing an urgent deficiency appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission and the Public Health Service, and in accordance with its custom the Senate again legislated on the subject of the Speedway Hospital, directing that the Secretary of the Treasury proceed without regard to the needs of the Public Health Service to complete this Speedway Hospital at a sum not exceeding \$3,000,000.

Now, what happened? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] presented that bill the afternoon the House adjourned for the holidays. There was not a quorum in the House, and I first made the point of no quorum. I then withdrew it until I could ascertain what was included in the Senate amendment. Then my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who, knowing what he said at that time, had to make a speech to-day, told us this would settle the question. I told him I was opposed to spending one dollar over the \$3,000,000, but because I had been told by gentlemen that this would settle the Speedway matter I would not insist upon a quorum and would vote for the bill, but that I feared they would come and ask for more than \$3,000,000. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] knows that he told us \$3,000,000 would build this hospital. If he is in doubt about it, I will read it to him. Mr. MADDEN said:

As far as I understand the situation, it is that the Secretary of the Treasury prepare plans for such buildings as he had suggested to him by the Public Health Service; that the people who are interested in this matter have agreed to complete the contract for the buildings on such a plan as he submits within the \$3,000,000.

And then in another place he says:

I think that within the \$3,000,000 proposed they can put up all the buildings they need.

And the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said practically the same thing, and I have great confidence in his judgment. I had such confidence in his judgment and the statements of these other gentlemen that I did not insist upon a quorum, did not oppose the conference report, and it went through.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] also had to make a speech to-day, because he went on record as agreeing to the \$3,000,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I read the language of the report.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know what you read, I do not recall your language, but in substance you did so agree. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] went further and said:

And the Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Treasury ought to understand that by taking this action it is the intention of Congress that this building and the 320 acres of land and the five auxiliary buildings shall be acquired within the present limit of cost.

And again he said:

It will be useless, so far as I am concerned, for the Secretary or the Public Health Service to come before the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of this House asking for anything in addition to the \$3,000,000 already appropriated for the purpose of acquiring this hospital.

And I say in justice to the gentleman from Iowa that he took the same position in conference, refusing to agree to the Senate amendment because of his promise to the House. Two or three weeks ago, when this subject was discussed, gentlemen charged the Secretary of the Treasury with refusing to sign this contract, when he had time and again offered to sign it for \$3,000,000. In the presence of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] Mr. GLASS offered to Mr. Hines the contract and said, "If you sign that with Mr. FORDNEY as a witness for \$3,000,000 I will agree to the changes you say you can make, which will save \$165,000, and will let you keep that \$165,000." And Mr. Hines refused to sign unless the contract included a provision giving him in addition to the \$3,000,000 a sum equaling the increase in labor and material since last October.

Mr. FORDNEY has told me that this offer was made in his presence. Time and again Mr. GLASS offered to sign it. Yet gentlemen sought to create the impression that the Secretary of

the Treasury was refusing to sign the contract as authorized by law. The gentlemen who are interested in this proposition submitted a contract which provided for \$3,000,000 plus an amount that would equal whatever increase in cost of material was incurred from October 16, 1919, by them. They not only did that, but I will call your attention to another thing right now. During the consideration of this matter, since Secretary Houston has become the Secretary of the Treasury, about February 8, they offered the Supervising Architect a contract which had a stipulation to provide that out of this \$3,500,000 that the Government shall pay \$28,856.96 to cover the increase in cost of labor from August 26, 1918, until March 15, 1919, before Congress ever legislated on the subject at all.

The stipulation reads:

It is also understood and agreed that the party of the second part has a claim for extra compensation already earned on account of the increase in the scales of labor wages between August 26, 1918, and March 15, 1919, and that the amount of said claim does not exceed \$28,856.96. The amount of this claim is subject to verification by the Supervising Architect and in the amount found by him to be due is payable out of the sum of \$3,500,000 authorized and appropriated for this project.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. You are not quoting the record, and I have the stipulation here in the papers, and I will be glad to show it to the gentleman—the language of it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman is referring to the stipulation in the final contract presented to the Secretary. What I have read is the stipulation first offered to the architect. I have read the original and copied it myself. They handed it to the Supervising Architect, and he stated that he could not even consider it, and it was not presented to Secretary Houston by the architect, and the contract that is now offered by Mr. Hines does not contain it. But it is not because they did not try to put it over.

Now, what are you going to do about it? Why, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says the reason for this action is that the cost of labor has gone up in two months. Before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman who represents Mr. Hines, Mr. Bennet, says first that in a letter, dated October 16, 1919, he had agreed to build this hospital for \$3,000,000; then he stated, on page 48, "What you have just read shows that we said then that we could not complete it for \$3,000,000, and we never would have been able to do it." This shows they never have had any idea of signing a contract for \$3,000,000. Then, on the same page, he says the reason he is not now willing to build for \$3,000,000 is the fact that labor has gone up in the last two months, just as Mr. MADDEN states. What has that got to do with it, when away back in January the Secretary of the Treasury offered to sign this contract for \$3,000,000? And when Mr. Bennet came before the conference committee he gave an entirely different excuse. He told us, "The increase in the cost of labor and material during the last 60 days is not great, but I am now asking for \$500,000 more because of the fact that the builders in Chicago have adopted a resolution to the effect that every contractor should insist upon this cost-plus provision, inasmuch as the union labor in Chicago is asking for an increase of wages, to take effect in April."

Gentlemen of the House, when I asked him to hand me the paper, the bulletin was marked "February," so that he never had seen it at the time he refused to sign that contract in January in the presence of Mr. FORDNEY, when Mr. GLASS offered it to him.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have no interest in this matter one way or the other, but I want to be able to vote intelligently.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Very well; go ahead and ask the question.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why did he refuse to sign the contract?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The last reason he gave was that in a bulletin that he has from the Builders' Exchange of Chicago it is stated that the union labor of Chicago asks for an increase of wages of 60 or 75 or some other large percentage, to take effect in April, and therefore it would not be safe for them, he says, to sign this contract without having in it this provision, paying for any increased cost of labor and material back to October. They want you in advance to appropriate \$500,000 so that labor will know they have the money to meet their increased demands and there is no incentive to him to keep down the cost of labor or material. And now for the first time, after they have denied time and time again that that provision in their contract would cost a single dollar over the \$3,000,000, they come in and say they want \$500,000 and admit that when they asked the Secretary to sign that contract

under the law limiting the cost to \$3,000,000 that they knew it would cost \$3,500,000. The Secretary of the Treasury agreed that they could make certain changes, provided these changes were approved by him. Mr. Houston stated in the presence of Mr. Bennet the other day "I will approve of the changes that will enable them to save about \$100,000." I said, "Mr. Secretary, if you can get them to sign that contract for \$3,000,000, will you agree to allow these changes and thus give them this \$100,000 extra?" He said, "Yes, but they will not agree." And Mr. Bennet stated then that they would not agree, even though they got this \$100,000. Then Mr. GOON said to Mr. Bennet: "You told me you could get out if you had those changes."

Now, I ask you to turn to the hearings here of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in December—not last March, but December 17 and 18, 1919—and here is what Mr. Bennet said:

I want to make it plain that the present contractors believe—and the Chicago people believe—that \$3,000,000 will erect a sufficient hospital for the needs of the Public Health Service.

Then gentlemen on that committee asked him whether, if they granted the legislation he wanted making it mandatory to accept this building, it would increase the appropriation, and he said, "Not a penny; not one cent."

Now, I will tell you why he took that position. The Secretary of the Treasury had discretion in the matter. They had to get that discretion out of the hands of the Secretary. If they had come in and asked Congress to take that discretion away and force him to sign the Speedway contract without regard to the needs of the Public Health Service and at the same time had asked for \$500,000 additional, Congress might not have done it, so that they take one bite at a time, and they make this provision mandatory in the first deficiency bill, and then in this deficiency bill they come in for \$500,000 additional. The Lord only knows what they will ask in the next bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to clear up one point on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I have not the time. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in whom I have great confidence, has been misled. They have all been misled. A deficiency bill came in here in July. It had legislation for the Speedway Hospital on it. The House gave what they asked. A deficiency bill came in here again in December. It had legislation for the Speedway Hospital on it. They all swore it would not cost a dollar more than \$3,000,000. The House gave what they asked. Now, this bill has legislation for the Speedway on it, and it will cost the people \$500,000. Later we will have another deficiency bill, and I am wondering how much more will be demanded.

You are in here within two months asking for \$500,000 more, one-sixth of the cost, and you are going to find these people asking for something on the next deficiency bill and on every deficiency bill that comes through the Senate. The Supervising Architect was right. The Government is buying an extraordinary amount of trouble. The only thing to do is to vote for my amendment and take \$3,000,000 and construct a hospital in Cook County, either on the marine hospital site or on land to be purchased, and in either event you will get it cheaper; for just as sure as I am standing here you are not now appropriating the last dollar for this building when you appropriate \$3,500,000. You can not tie them up in a contract. I have seen Houdini down here at Keith's Theater, and I would rather undertake to tie up Houdini than to tie up these people in a contract and hope to hold them to it. You can not do it. Every time a deficiency bill comes in here pressure is brought to bear to secure some legislation they desire. The present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Houston, is a very good man, but he does not know what he has gotten into. He said the other day that he was not able to attend to any business of the office of the Secretary of the Treasury except the Speedway business, and I fear he will have time for little else if you do not adopt my amendment and abandon this Speedway building. Gentlemen, the Court of Claims in the final analysis will wind up the affairs of the Speedway Hospital, because you can not bind them.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman tell us what was the original character of the construction of this building?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Constructed out of the girders of the grand stand of the speedway and the other

material purchased for stands. Of course, additional material had to be purchased.

Mr. GARD. Was that a race track?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. A race track.

Mr. SABATH. It was an entirely new building.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said that Mr. Hines lost a million dollars in this thing. I know he was so informed; but what are the facts? The Supervising Architect sent his experts to look at the building which is now standing in Chicago. Mr. Hines says it is worth \$1,600,000—\$300,000 for the land and \$1,300,000 for the building. The Government experts went over the building and their estimate is that the building is worth only \$1,000,000 instead of \$1,300,000. So when you take over this building you give him \$1,600,000 for land and building when the Supervising Architect's experts say it is worth \$1,300,000, and you give him \$1,900,000 to complete it. You not only give him \$500,000 velvet, but you give him the \$300,000 over and above what the officials of the Government say his building is worth. Then, in addition to that, he is going to get the changes in the interest of economy which amount to \$165,000 according to Mr. Hines, but only \$100,000 according to Mr. Houston. Now, that is what you are going to do. My friend from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] said to his colleague [Mr. MANN] that he would vote for any appropriation for that. Of course he would.

Mr. SABATH. Not for that. I said for this purpose.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; for that purpose. You could offer an amendment for \$5,000,000 and he would vote for it, and we all know it, and there are other good-hearted gentlemen here who will vote for it at any time; but, my friends, we have a duty to perform. It may be an unpleasant duty, but you have got to protect the Treasury sometimes, and when you quarrel here day after day to save a dollar here and a dollar there by cutting somebody's salary and then come in here and throw away \$500,000 at one time when it is unnecessary you are not making any saving.

Adopt my amendment, and before Monday morning, before the Senate can act on this matter, Mr. Hines will sign that contract for \$3,000,000. He would not let it get away from him. The Secretary of the Treasury could not take an aeroplane and get away from him. There is no chance for it. Talk to me about sentiment! I hate to say a word about it, because I have no doubt that Mr. Hines's son was a splendid young man. He was a lieutenant who died in France, not in battle but in sickness, just as much a hero as if he had died in battle; but I do not believe in coming in here and under the cloak of a soldier who died in France trying to appropriate money from the Treasury in this manner. If Mr. Hines, who is a millionaire, was commemorating the death of his son, would he come here to-day and refuse to sign this contract for \$3,000,000 when it is the amount he asked for in December, and his representative, Mr. Bennet, promised time and again they would complete it for \$3,000,000? Would he come in here and try to get \$28,000 to cover the increase in the cost of labor and material between August, 1918, and March, 1919, before the Government ever touched it? That does not look like sentiment. The gentleman from Illinois says Mr. Hines is giving the Government a million dollars. Great God, I never knew a man in my life who needed to employ a lawyer to spend six months here trying to force the Government to take a million dollars away from him. Looking a gift horse in the mouth! Yes; sometimes you had better do it when they come and tell you they are giving a million dollars away. One day in the discussion on the floor here I heard the gentleman from Dakota say that Mr. Hines would not sign the contract drawn up by Mr. GLASS, because it would cost the Government more than \$3,000,000. And now they are asking for \$500,000 more than the \$3,000,000. Did you ever hear of such a thing? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GOOD and Mr. GARRETT moved a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Brumbaugh	Costello	Dominick
Bacharach	Byrnes, Tenn.	Crago	Dooling
Bell	Campbell, Pa.	Cramton	Doughton
Benham	Caraway	Crowther	Dunn
Blackmon	Clark, Fla.	Currie, Mich.	Ellsworth
Booher	Classon	Curry, Calif.	Emerson
Bowers	Cooper	Dewalt	Ferris
Browning	Copley	Dickinson, Mo.	Fess

Fields	Kennedy, R. I.
Flood	Kless
Fuller, Mass.	Kreider
Gallivan	Langley
Godwin, N. C.	Larsen
Goodall	Layton
Gould	Lea, Calif.
Graham, Pa.	Leshner
Griest	Lufkin
Hamill	Luhning
Hamilton	McCulloch
Haugen	McDuffie
Hoey	McFadden
Hudspeth	Major
Hullings	Mann, S. C.
Hutchinson	Mansfield
Jefferis	Montague
Johnson, Miss.	Moore, Ohio
Johnston, N. Y.	Moore, Va.
Kelley, Mich.	Moore, Ind.
Kennedy, Iowa	Morin

Neely
Nicholls, S. C.
Nichols, Mich.
O'Connell
O'Connor
Paige
Parker
Pell
Purnell
Radcliffe
Reber
Riordan
Robison, Ky.
Rodenberg
Rose
Rowan
Rucker
Saunders, Va.
Schall
Scully
Sears

Sells
Shreve
Slemp
Smith, Ill.
Smith, N. Y.
Snell
Snyder
Steagall
Steele
Stephens, Miss.
Stoll
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Swope
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Ward
Watson
Whaley
Wheeler

The SPEAKER. On this call 313 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to modify the amendment which I have offered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with the following substitute:

"To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out at once the provisions of paragraphs A and B of section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for the discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919, the limit of cost of the acquisition of the site and uncompleted buildings and the completion of the construction of the hospital building in Cook County, Ill., authorized by said act, is hereby increased from \$3,000,000 to \$3,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of said sum so appropriated shall be used to pay any profit to either the owners of the land and present uncompleted buildings or to the contractor for the completion of the work."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, is my modification agreed to?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let us understand the parliamentary situation. My colleague offered the original proposition, and to that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] offered an amendment by way of substitute. Now, if my colleague has withdrawn his motion and offered a new one instead of asking for a modification of his original motion, on which will the vote first come? Does he offer it as an original proposition?

Mr. CANNON. No; I modify my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I live in Illinois. [Applause.] Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, and various other States, with a great population, center about the great city of Chicago. I saw a newspaper statement the other day that Chicago, as will be shown by the census, is the most populous city in the world. If it is not, it soon will be. There is a great population to be served, and a large part of that population was in this contest to win the war. [Applause.] This is a proposition to care for the disabled, the people that were wounded, the people that are sick. It is needed, and needed as speedily as possible.

Now, this is a proposition to increase the limit of cost not \$500,000 but \$400,000. Oh, a gift, says my friend, to this speculator for his half section of land and unfinished hospital. Nay, nay; not a gift, but a proposition that there shall be no profit to him nor to the contractor.

Now, the present Secretary of the Treasury we had before us for an hour going over this matter while we were in conference. He is desirous—and I measure my words—that this site shall be acquired and the hospital be completed. What does the gentleman from South Carolina propose in lieu of this?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Briefly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Secretary of the Treasury said he wished it understood that he was making no recommendation about this at all.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands that he is favorable to it, that he desires to acquire it, and the whole conversation showed that he is friendly to the proposition, as he ought to be.

Now, what is the alternative offered by the gentleman from South Carolina? It is to construct a hospital from the foundation, including the site, for \$3,000,000. The Government has no site except where the Marine Hospital is situated, about 15 acres. There is a hospital on that as against 320 acres well drained which is 6 miles from State Street with a hard road, with an elevated road within a mile of it. Why, you could not do the drainage that they have got there into the Des Plaines River for many hundred thousands of dollars.

Oh, but there is something wrong about this, says my friend. Great heavens, it was a speedway, and they used the steel girders to construct this hospital in this arrangement. Good Lord, is the steel spoiled? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. No; I have only 6 minutes. Now, is this hospital needed? Yes. Ought the limit of cost to be increased \$400,000? Yes. Why? Because you can not buy, as I am credibly informed, materials to complete this building except by agreeing to pay the price when delivered, which is constantly advancing. Everybody knows that prices are constantly advancing as the country is trying to get back to the normal rate of erecting buildings. Insurance? A prudent man insures. Notice has been given by the union working people that on the 1st day of April the wages will be increased 50 per cent in that great city, and have notified contractors that they have got to be careful to include that increase in their contracts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for two minutes more not to be taken out of the time allotted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that if the Byrnes substitute is adopted this contract will be signed within a few hours afterwards and we will save \$400,000?

Mr. CANNON. No. I deny the truth of that, because these 320 acres are worth far more if you tear down the hospital than they were worth with the advancing prices of real estate and the depreciated currency that we have. What is the sensible thing to do? Not to exhibit a lot of temper, but to determine what, in that center of population, will provide a great hospital to care for the soldiers who are sick and wounded, and what will provide it most speedily, without profit, without one cent of profit, under the direct supervision of the present Secretary of the Treasury, with all of his officials, under a contract that enables him to comply with these provisions. I hope to God it may be completed for less than \$3,400,000, and it will be, provided it can be under that contract and under that superintendence. There is nothing for insurance, nothing for the advance of wages, nothing for the advance of material. I would not take this contract if you would make it \$1,000,000 instead of \$400,000—not \$500,000. We strike out the appropriation and we authorized the expenditure of \$400,000, and I believe it will be completed for less than that. My God, what kind of word are you going to send to this great soldier population in this great center of the great Northwest? Are you going to tell them that there was a little disagreement with the former Secretary of the Treasury, or a little disagreement about this or that or the other, and that the contract was not made? A plague on the contractor, a plague on everybody concerned! I want to be practical. There is no place for you to spend your \$3,000,000. God knows what 320 acres or half that amount would cost, if you chose to condemn or to purchase. You know the people who are lame and halt and blind do not understand about the fuss between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the Chicago contractor. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to assure the House that I think no Member of the House is more embarrassed over the hospital situation than I am. I have tried as best I could to have this hospital building completed within the limit of cost. I am sorry that the contract was not signed six months ago, when it might have been possible to complete the contract within the limit of cost. I hope it can still be completed within that limit. All depends upon the labor and material market. The question that I have been called upon to decide is, Shall I adhere to my former position and avoid personal embarrassments and prevent the building of a much-needed hospital for our sick and wounded discharged soldiers or face the embarrassment and help secure the hospital facilities

asked for by the present Secretary of the Treasury? I wish from the bottom of my heart that the Treasury Department had one program with regard to the building of all of these hospitals. At Chicago the Secretary of the Treasury will not sign this contract because there is a provision in it which might require the expenditure of more than the limit of cost, and in that I commend his action; but at Dawsonsprings, Ky., where he is authorized to build a hospital for 500 beds at a limit of cost of \$1,500,000, he does not adopt the same program. Here he has a plan for 23 hospital buildings and a limit of cost of \$1,500,000, and has let a contract for one building for \$500,000, and proposed to build the 22 hospital buildings at day labor, and how much they will cost nobody knows, and the Treasury does not and can not know and seemingly does not care!

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman ought not to state what is not true.

Mr. GOOD. He is proceeding to build one building for \$500,000, leaving \$1,000,000 for 22 buildings, but for the hospital at Chicago, where, by the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, not one penny shall be paid for profit, but where the limit of cost shall only be increased by a sufficient amount to complete the contract, if there shall be an increase in the cost of labor and materials.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Secretary says that that statement is absolutely not true; that he has not done it, and that he will not do it.

Mr. GOOD. I was told by Maj. Perry, supervising architect of the Public Health Service and in charge of this building program, this morning that the contract for the main building had been signed and that the other buildings would be built by day labor for \$500,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Comptroller of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury say that that is not so.

Mr. GOOD. And Maj. Perry told me also that the contract had been signed, and that the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. had the contract—the very concern that Mr. Graft told us about when he said the president of the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. had told him he had an understanding with Mr. Doyle, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, that he should have all of the contracts, whether he was the lowest bidder or not. I want to say to the gentleman that the present sundry civil appropriation bill carries an appropriation of \$123,000 to add to the marine hospital building in Chicago. Not a dollar has been expended; and yet, of all places in the United States, Chicago is most in need of hospital accommodations, and this appropriation was to provide for 43 additional beds. The gentleman from South Carolina brings here a proposition—and you must accept that or the proposition offered by the gentleman from Illinois—in which it is provided that the Secretary of the Treasury shall reject this contract and build a hospital there on the marine hospital grounds, or buy lands and build a new hospital. The marine hospital grounds are a small tract of land, with a frontage of 504 feet, extending back about 700 to 850 feet, with a long building on it now, and yet he proposes to build on that lot of ground, surrounded by apartment houses, a hospital, if you please, to take care of 1,000 of our soldiers! To build a new hospital—and you can not build a new hospital without paying profits, and profits on increased costs.

The gentleman from Illinois offers a motion to increase the limit of cost of the Broadview, but the motion of the gentleman from Illinois provided that no part of the authorized appropriation shall be paid in profits. In the one case we are to vote for profits and in the other we vote to secure a hospital without the payment of profits. Take your choice. I am sorry that it is necessary to increase this limit of cost, but I hold in my hand the publication of the labor organizations of Chicago in which they serve notice on the contractors that if any contract is entered into for a lump sum it should include the same provisions that it carried in this contract, and that is, that if there is an increase in the cost of labor or an increase in the cost of material after October 16, 1919, and the contractors are obliged to pay that increase, then and in that case the limit of cost shall be increased for enough to take care of it. The motion of the gentleman from Illinois specifically provides that not a penny of profit shall be paid to Mr. Hines or to the contractor.

What must Congress want? We have given all kinds of profits to the Army and Navy contractors, to contractors in the Treasury Department, and are asked to pay profits to some new contractors, but we say that we will not accept a building already partly constructed to house those boys who are sick, who carried the flag to imperishable glory, because, forsooth, the

contractor agrees to build it without profit to the Government of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 81, nays 228, not voting 119, as follows:

YEAS—81.

Almon	Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Sisson
Ayres	Drane	Lankford	Small
Bankhead	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Stedman
Barkley	Evans, Mont.	McClintie	Stevenson
Bee	Evans, Nev.	McKeown	Sumners, Tex.
Black	Fisher	Mays	Taylor, Ark.
Blanton	Gard	Moon	Thomas
Box	Garner	Moore, Va.	Tillman
Brand	Garrett	Nelson, Mo.	Upshaw
Briggs	Goodwin, Ark.	Oldfield	Venable
Brinson	Griffin	Oliver	Vinson
Buchanan	Hardy, Tex.	Overstreet	Watkins
Byrnes, S. C.	Hastings	Padgett	Weaver
Candler	Hedin	Park	Welling
Carter	Howard	Quin	Wingo
Clark, Mo.	Huddleston	Rainey, Ala.	Wise
Collier	Jacoway	Robinson, N. C.	Wright
Connally	Johnson, Ky.	Romjue	Young, Tex.
Crisp	Jones, Tex.	Rouse	
Davis, Tenn.	Kinchee	Rubey	
Dent	Kitchin	Sims	

NAYS—228.

Ackerman	Fordney	Linthicum	Reed, W. Va.
Anderson	Poster	Little	Rhodes
Andrews, Nebr.	Freeman	Loneragan	Ricketts
Anthony	French	Longworth	Riddick
Ashbrook	Fuller, Ill.	Luce	Rogers
Aswell	Gallagher	McAndrews	Rowe
Babka	Gandy	McArthur	Sabath
Baer	Ganly	McGlennan	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	Garland	McKenzie	Sanders, La.
Begg	Glynn	McKinley	Sanders, N. Y.
Benham	Goldfogle	McKinley	Sanford
Benson	Good	McLane	Scott
Bland, Mo.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherwood
Bland, Va.	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Siegel
Boies	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Sinclair
Britten	Greene, Mass.	MacCrate	Sinnott
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Vt.	MacGregor	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Hadley	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Burdick	Hardy, Colo.	Magee	Smithwick
Burke	Harrel	Maher	Steenserson
Burroughs	Haugen	Mann, Ill.	Stephens, Ohio
Butler	Hawley	Mapes	Stiness
Caldwell	Hays	Martin	Strong, Kans.
Campbell, Kans.	Hernandez	Mason	Summers, Wash.
Cannon	Hersey	Mead	Sweet
Caraw	Hersman	Merritt	Tague
Carss	Hicks	Michener	Taylor, Colo.
Casey	Hicks	Miller	Taylor, Tenn.
Chindblom	Hill	Minahan, N. J.	Temple
Christopherson	Hoch	Monahan, Wis.	Thompson
Cleary	Holland	Mondell	Tilson
Coady	Houghton	Mooney	Timberlake
Cole	Hull, Iowa	Morgan	Timmer
Cullen	Hull, Tenn.	Mott	Tinkham
Dale	Humphreys	Mudd	Townner
Dallinger	Husted	Murphy	Treadway
Darrow	Igoe	Nelson, Wis.	Valle
Davey	Ireland	Newton, Minn.	Vare
Davis, Minn.	James	Newton, Mo.	Vestal
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Voigt
Denison	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor	Volstead
Dickinson, Iowa	Jones, Pa.	Ogden	Walsh
Donovan	Juul	Olney	Walters
Doremus	Kahn	Osborne	Wason
Dowell	Kearns	Parrish	Webster
Dunbar	Keller	Peters	Welder
Dunn	Kendall	Phelan	White, Kans.
Dupré	Kettner	Platt	White, Me.
Eagan	King	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, Ill.
Echols	Kinkaid	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, La.
Edmonds	Kleeska	Raker	Wilson, Pa.
Elliot	Knutson	Ramsey	Winslow
Elston	Kraus	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Lampert	Randall, Calif.	Woods, Va.
Evans, Nebr.	Lazaro	Randall, Wis.	Young, N. Dak.
Fairfield	Lea, Calif.	Rayburn	Zihlman
Focht	Leibach	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—119.

Andrews, Md.	Classon	Emerson	Harrison
Bacharach	Cooper	Ferris	Hayden
Bell	Copley	Fess	Hoey
Blackmon	Costello	Fields	Hudspeth
Bland, Ind.	Crabo	Flood	Hulings
Boohar	Cramton	Frear	Hutchinson
Bowers	Crowther	Fuller, Mass.	Jefferis
Brooks, Pa.	Currie, Mich.	Gallivan	Johnson, Miss.
Browning	Curry, Calif.	Godwin, N. C.	Johnston, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Dewalt	Goodall	Kelley, Mich.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Dominick	Gould	Kelly, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Dooling	Graham, Pa.	Kennedy, Iowa
Cantrill	Doughton	Griest	Kennedy, R. I.
Caraway	Dyer	Hamill	Kless
Clark, Fla.	Ellsworth	Hamilton	Kreider

Langley	Morin	Robison, Ky.	Snyder
Larsen	Neely	Rodenberg	Steagall
Layton	Nicholls, S. C.	Rose	Steele
Leshar	Nichols, Mich.	Rowan	Stephens, Miss.
Luffkin	O'Connell	Rucker	Stoll
Lubring	Paige	Saunders, Va.	Strong, Pa.
McCulloch	Parker	Schall	Sullivan
McDuffie	Pell	Scully	Swope
McFadden	Porter	Sears	Ward
Major	Pou	Sells	Watson
Mann, S. C.	Purnell	Shreve	Whaley
Mansfield	Radcliffe	Slomp	Williams
Montague	Reavis	Smith, Ill.	Woodard
Moore, Ohio	Reber	Smith, N. Y.	Yates
Moore, Ind.	Riordan	Snell	

So the substitute was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. DOMINICK (for) with Mr. GALLIVAN (against).

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. BELL.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. POU.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. LAYTON with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. HOEY.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. HUDSPETH.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No, I was not; I thought it was a point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 196, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 34.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

For the preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$3,000,000.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a preferential motion. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit it.

Mr. TINKHAM. I desire to move that the House recede from the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 34 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 34 and agree to the same with an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That such parts of this appropriation as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy may be necessary may be applied to the objects of expenditure specified in the appropriations for various bureaus of the department for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOOD. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and not germane.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly in order to distinguish this amendment from the ruling which the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole made on this very paragraph, as the Chair remembers.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is entirely distinct in that this provides a disposition of the various funds. It applies to the entire appropriation and its use, whereas the amendments which were offered when the bill was being originally considered were ruled out as not being germane. No point was raised in relation to its incompetence as legislation. In other words, the same point of order is not involved in any way.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that the last proviso is unauthorized by law and that it introduces a new subject upon an appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the points of order. The Chair thinks that clearly the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] extends this appropriation, which is made for yards and docks, over the whole Navy Department, and is subject to the ruling which was made in the committee on this subject.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I then desire to withdraw the amendment, and make a simple motion that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 34 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 34 and concur.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say this: It is not my intention to curtail the right of debate at all on the items in this bill. Four or five roll calls have been had to-day by gentlemen who simply want to carry this bill over, which ought to get back into conference and become a law. Now, I have said to two of my colleagues on the committee that I would yield them five minutes each; but I propose after they have had five minutes apiece to take one minute and then move the previous question.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] has the floor.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is the same amendment which has been before this House three separate times. It is an amendment, although reduced in amount, providing an appropriation of \$3,000,000, instead of \$9,000,000, for the essential repair of ships of the line which have been in constant use during the war, and recommended not only as an emergency appropriation but one necessary for the national defense.

In the first deficiency bill the honorable Representative from Iowa stood before you and said that it was absolutely essential; that it was in the nature of economy, as the repairs had to be made; that there should be an allowance of \$9,000,000. How can he stand here to-day and say with any consistency that \$3,000,000 four months afterwards is not necessary? The amendment which now is before the House was proposed by Senator LODGE, the Republican leader of the Senate, and supported in several speeches, one by Senator KNOX of Pennsylvania and one by Senator POINDEXTER of Washington. Had I the time I would read the convincing reasons they all gave why the Republican leadership in this Congress, both the House and Senate, should support this essential appropriation for the rehabilitation of our Navy and in the interest of national defense. In the amendment you have only \$3,000,000 for the essential repairs of ships of the line, which the very Appropriation Committee is now opposing who reported five months ago that \$9,000,000 was not only necessary but in the interest of economy, as repairs must be made and the sooner they were made the less they would cost. Had I the time I should like to read the fervid address of the honorable Representative from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] for this purpose, who now is head and front of the opposition. The appropriation for \$3,000,000 which I am proposing passed the Senate by unanimous vote, and only yesterday, after the disagreement with House conferees, by unanimous vote the Senate instructed their conferees to include the item in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly state that I believe the Republican leadership in the Senate is wiser and more patriotic, as well as more intelligent, than the Republican leadership in this House, in relation to this item at least. It is not in the nature of economy to postpone the repairs which must be done, as the longer that such repairs remain undone, particularly in relation to naval construction, the greater will be the cost. The House is entirely inconsistent if it refuses that appropriation of \$3,000,000 in view of its passing for the same purpose \$9,000,000 five months ago. The opposition springs not from a spirit of economy but through blind following of bad leadership. The mistake should not be made.

I now yield, Mr. Speaker, one minute to the honorable Representative from New York [Mr. MAHER].

Mr. MAHER. Do you believe that it is good economy to refuse \$3,000,000 for the repair of Government ships, while on last Saturday this House voted hundreds of millions of dollars to repair the property of the railroad owners of this country?

Mr. TINKHAM. I absolutely do not believe it is sound, consistent, or broad public policy.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may express the hope that the motion of the gentleman will carry.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read, now that it is brought to my attention, a communication from the Secretary

of the Navy, Mr. Daniels, to the honorable Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, in relation to this appropriation:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 3, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. BUTLER: I feel that your constant interest in the welfare of the Navy has led you to give serious attention to the necessity of an immediate deficiency appropriation, as set forth in my letter of January 21 last to the Speaker of the House, with its accompanying letters from the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chiefs of the Bureaus of Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Yards and Docks (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 31, 1920).

In my frequent representations of the urgent need of additional funds for completing the essential postwar repairs and alterations on our capital ships and on the requisite destroyers, submarines, and other craft that go to make up a well-rounded fleet, I have tried to refrain from alarmist predictions and to present the case of the Navy's need in temperate language and without exaggeration. The detail facts are set forth in the correspondence referred to above, and I have been at personal pains to verify those facts. In the present condition of funds there is no possibility of completing work this fiscal year on 6 of our 15 dreadnoughts. None of our 13 predreadnoughts can be completed, nor any of the 7 armored cruisers which require repairs.

Certain changes necessary to bring the military efficiency of destroyers up to present-day standards can not be undertaken, and it will be impossible to place our submarines in a condition for effective action.

In the present unsettled condition of world affairs I do not believe it is possible, with safety, to delay repairs on these vessels until July 1 next, when the new appropriation for maintenance and upkeep becomes available, or to some indefinite date in the future, as is now the case. The discharge of 13,900 skilled workmen from our industrial yards, as it is estimated will be necessary if funds are not made available for essential military repairs, will seriously cripple our present industrial organization and necessitate later the slow rebuilding of a system which is now functioning effectively. I therefore strongly urge your good offices in presenting to the House these facts, which speak for themselves, with a view to securing the funds requested in the naval deficiency estimate.

I am sending a similar letter to Hon. L. P. FADGETT, of the committee.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. T. S. BUTLER, M. C.,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, now I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, when this item for the maintenance and repair of ships of the Navy was first suggested, it was \$9,300,000. At that time, in the first deficiency bill, it passed this House unanimously. When it went to conference the Senate conference committee urged an item of \$20,000,000 for airplanes. The Navy was sacrificed to the extent of that appropriation as an offset to the airplane appropriation of \$20,000,000. When the present deficiency bill was considered it was argued that if this item were placed in the bill, namely, \$9,300,000 for the Navy, the Senate would strike it out. That did not happen. The Senate has inserted an item of \$3,000,000 in this bill.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] presented that amendment; and without the slightest thought of reflecting on the policy of economy, as expressed by this House, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] said on the floor of the Senate that a policy of economy which meant to destroy or which meant to permit the deterioration of the ships of the American Navy was a cheese-paring policy. I want to go a shade further and say that, so far as I am concerned, I regard it as not only unwise but petty economy.

The Republican management of the House has started out to pare these bills below a certain percentage of the estimates. It seems to me that, having already pared this estimate to the extent of 67 per cent, they might with good grace say to this House, "We will permit this item of \$3,000,000 to stay in the bill."

I appeal to my colleagues on this side of the House to make this appropriation of \$3,000,000 at this time on this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in making the statement about closing debate I did not intend to cut off my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. If he desires time, of course, I shall yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not desire any time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, just a word about this item. It is as useless as the fifth wheel to a wagon unless we carry with it the other appropriations requested. [Applause.]

I have here a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, asking that this appropriation, if made at all, be so made that he can spend it for all of the bureaus which have to carry on the work as it is carried on in the Navy. When the estimate was made for the Bureau of Construction and Repair, it called for \$3,250,000. That was made in conjunction with a further estimate of

\$1,050,000 for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, a further estimate of \$2,500,000 for the Bureau of Steam Engineering, and a still further estimate of \$2,500,000 for the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Now, this item has to do only with the hulls of the vessels. They could not expend a dollar of this money for steam engineering or for any of those other related purposes; it is a useless expenditure. It is a useless appropriation, because it could not be judiciously expended if appropriated. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VARE. Do I understand that those who wish to support the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] will vote "aye"?

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts will vote "aye."

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 91, nays 202, answered "present" 2, not voting 133, as follows:

YEAS—91.

Anthony	Eagan	Lampert	Padgett
Aswell	Eagle	Lazaro	Peters
Benson	Edmonds	Lea, Calif.	Phelan
Bland, Mo.	Elston	Linthicum	Pou
Buchanan	Focht	Loneragan	Rainey, H. T.
Burdick	Gallagher	McAndrews	Rainey, J. W.
Burke	Gandy	McGlennnon	Rogers
Burroughs	Ganly	McKiniry	Rouse
Byrnes, S. C.	Garland	McLane	Sabath
Caldwell	Garner	MacCrate	Sanders, La.
Carew	Garrett	Madden	Siegel
Carrs	Goldfogle	Maher	Smithwick
Casey	Greene, Mass.	Martin	Summers, Wash.
Cleary	Griffin	Mays	Tague
Coady	Hadley	Mead	Tinkham
Cullen	Holland	Miller	Vare
Dallinger	Humphreys	Minahan, N. J.	Walters
Darrow	Igoe	Mooney	Webster
Davey	Ireland	Nolan	White, Me.
Donovan	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor	Wilson, La.
Dunbar	Jones, Pa.	Oldfield	Wilson, Pa.
Dupré	Keller	Olney	Zihlman
	Kelly, Pa.	Osborne	

NAYS—202.

Ackerman	Echols	King	Randall, Calif.
Almon	Elliott	Kinkaid	Randall, Wis.
Anderson	Esch	Kitchin	Rayburn
Andrews, Md.	Evans, Mont.	Klecicka	Reed, N. Y.
Ashbrook	Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.
Ayres	Evans, Nev.	Lanham	Rhodes
Babka	Fairfield	Lankford	Ricketts
Baer	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Riddick
Bankhead	Fordney	Lehlbach	Robinson, N. C.
Barbour	Foster	Little	Romjue
Barkley	Freeman	Longworth	Rowe
Bee	French	Luce	Rubey
Begg	Fuller, Ill.	McClintic	Sanders, Ind.
Benham	Gard	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Black	Glynn	McKeown	Sanford
Blanton	Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Scott
Box	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sherwood
Brand	Goodykoontz	McPherson	Sinclair
Briggs	Green, Iowa	MacGregor	Sinnott
Brinson	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Slisson
Britten	Hardy, Colo.	Mann, Ill.	Small
Brooks, Ill.	Harrel	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Browne	Harrison	Mason	Stedman
Butler	Hastings	Merritt	Steenerson
Byrns, Tenn.	Haugen	Michener	Stephens, Ohio
Campbell, Kans.	Hawley	Monahan, Wis.	Stevenson
Candler	Hays	Mondell	Stiness
Cannon	Heflin	Moon	Strong, Kans.
Carter	Hernandez	Moore, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Chindblom	Hersey	Morgan	Sweet
Christopherson	Hickey	Mott	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Mo.	Hicks	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Cole	Hill	Murphy	Taylor, Tenn.
Collier	Hoch	Nelson, Mo.	Temple
Connally	Howard	Nelson, Wis.	Thomas
Crisp	Huddleston	Newton, Minn.	Thompson
Dale	Hull, Tenn.	Newton, Mo.	Tillman
Davis, Minn.	Husted	Ogden	Tilson
Davis, Tenn.	Jacoway	Overstreet	Timberlake
Dempsey	James	Park	Tincher
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parrish	Towner
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Platt	Treadway
Dickinson, Iowa	Juul	Quin	Upshaw
Dowell	Kearns	Rainey, Ala.	Valle
Draue	Kendall	Raker	Venable
Dunn	Kincheloe	Ramseyer	Vestal

Vinson
Voigt
Volstead
Walsh
Watkins

Weaver
Welling
Welty
Wheeler
White, Kans.

Wilson, Ill.
Wingo
Winslow
Wise
Wood, Ind.

Woods, Va.
Wright
Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.
Knutson
Oliver

NOT VOTING—133.

Andrews, Nebr.	Fess	Langley	Rose
Bacharach	Fields	Larsen	Rowan
Bell	Flood	Layton	Rucker
Blackmon	Frear	Leshner	Saunders, Va.
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Mass.	Lufkin	Schall
Boles	Gallivan	Luhling	Scully
Booher	Godwin, N. C.	McArthur	Sears
Bowers	Goodall	McCulloch	Sells
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	McDuffie	Shreve
Browning	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Sims
Brumbaugh	Graham, Ill.	McKinley	Slomp
Campbell, Pa.	Griest	Major	Smith, Idaho
Cantrill	Hamill	Mann, S. C.	Smith, Ill.
Caraway	Hamilton	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Hardy, Tex.	Montague	Snell
Classon	Hayden	Moore, Ohio	Snyder
Cooper	Hersman	Moore, Ind.	Stegall
Copley	Hoey	Morin	Steele
Costello	Houghton	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Crago	Hudspeth	Nicholls, S. C.	Stoll
Cramton	Hullings	Nichols, Mich.	Strong, Pa.
Crowther	Hull, Iowa	O'Connell	Sullivan
Currie, Mich.	Hutchinson	Palge	Swope
Curry, Calif.	Jefferis	Parker	Ward
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Pell	Wason
Dewalt	Johnson, Miss.	Porter	Watson
Dominick	Johnston, N. Y.	Purnell	Whaley
Dooling	Kahn	Radcliffe	Williams
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsey	Woodyard
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	Yates
Dyer	Kennedy, R. I.	Reber	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Kettner	Riordan	
Emerson	Kless	Robison, Ky.	
Ferris	Kreider	Rodenberg	

So the motion to recede and concur was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. JOHNSTON of New York (for) with Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (against).

Mr. O'CONNELL (for) with Mr. WASON (against).

Mr. GALLIVAN (for) with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa (against).

Mr. WHALEY (for) with Mr. OLIVER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HARDY of Texas.

Mr. YATES with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. WARD with Mr. WELTY.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. WHALEY, and I desire to withdraw my vote and to be recorded "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the House having refused to recede and concur, is not that equivalent to a vote to disagree?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. FLOOD, indefinitely on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. MOORE of Ohio (at the request of Mr. FOSTER), for three days on account of sickness in his family.

CLAIM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 664).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State and accompanying papers in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States based on the action of the authorities of Hudson County, N. J., in holding for their appearance as witnesses in a criminal case in that county, in violation of treaty provi-

sions between the United States and Norway, as the Norwegian Government alleges, three members of the crew of a Norwegian ship called the *Ingrid*, and I recommend that, as an act of grace, and without reference to the question of the liability of the United States, an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of State.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
28 February, 1920.

WOODROW WILSON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the bill H. R. 12046.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the conference report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 29, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the United States Housing Corporation, transmitting report from March 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, in accordance with act of May 16, 1918, and July 19, 1919 (vols. 1 and 2), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WINSLOW, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 451) requesting the Federal Trade Commission to make certain inquiries into the prices of combed cotton yarns, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 692), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JAMES, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) authorizing the Secretary of War to bring back on Army transports from Danzig, Poland, residents of the United States of Polish origin who were engaged in the war on the side of the allied and associated powers, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 687), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11877) granting the consent of Congress to Madison and Rankin Counties, in the State of Mississippi, to construct a bridge across the Pearl River between Madison and Rankin Counties, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 689), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3696) to change the time for holding court in Laurinburg, eastern district of North Carolina, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 688), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ramon Ricardo Arias, a citizen of Panama, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 690), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1288) for the relief of George W. Gamble, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 685), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12634) for the relief of Wilhelm Alexander, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 686), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GLYNN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7573) authorizing payment of compensation to Pasquale Dolce for personal injuries, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 693), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8881) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind., for the loss of war-savings stamps and thrift stamps, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 694), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11989) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Morrison; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12092) granting a pension to John Van Dyne; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12517) for the relief of Warren J. Deems and Mrs. Anna Leppo; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12816) to further define malfeasance in office, providing punishment therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12817) providing for a survey of White River, Ind., with a view of controlling flood waters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12818) providing for a survey of White River, Ind., with a view to making same navigable; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12819) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to waive the age limit for admission to the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 12820) to create revenue in lieu of the excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12821) to create revenue for defraying, carrying out, contributing toward, or meeting the requirements of any legislation to be presently enacted awarding funds to any enlisted or commissioned man in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who has now or may hereafter receive an honorable discharge therefrom; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12822) to amend subdivision 3 of section 214 of an act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12823) to authorize the sale or lease of real estate or any interest therein acquired for the use of the Army since April 6, 1917, and no longer needed therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12824) to authorize coinage of 25-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Alabama into the Union; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WALSH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 302) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of

the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 304) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to open certain naval radio stations for the use of the general public; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: Resolution (H. Res. 475) calling for information from the War Department concerning motor trucks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: Resolution (H. Res. 476) to investigate the administration of the Federal reserve act since its passage; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 12825) for the relief of the Great Lakes Engineering Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12826) authorizing the appointment of Paymaster T. DeF. Harris as pay inspector in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12827) to remove the charge of desertion standing against George W. Rauey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 12828) granting a pension to George E. Tolin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 12829) granting a pension to May Belle McDermott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 12830) granting a pension to Fredericka Bauersfeld; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 12831) granting a pension to Margaret Judge; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12832) for the relief of Julia A. Reid; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 12833) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12834) granting a pension to George W. Dille; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 12835) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. O. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 12836) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12837) granting a pension to Annie Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12838) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Hopper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12839) granting a pension to William Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12840) granting a pension to Isabella B. Slayter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12841) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Greenawalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 12842) for the relief of the estate of William Alger Varner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12843) granting a pension to Henrietta Riedel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12844) granting a pension to Clinton E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12845) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12846) granting a pension to Adelia Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12847) granting a pension to George L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1922. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Master Builders' Association of Des Moines, Iowa, urging the defeat of H. R. 10738; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1923. Also (by request), petition of employees of the Whitcomb-Blaisdell Machine Tool Co., of Worcester, Mass., against the adoption of the metric system; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1924. Also, petition of the Polish Citizens' Committee of Ludlow, Mass., relative to certain legislation, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1925. By Mr. BEGG: Resolutions of Perry Post, No. 83, American Legion, Sandusky, Erie County, Ohio, urging action of Congress giving a \$50 bond for each month of service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1926. By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: Petition of Mr. L. Hubbard and other citizens of Newport News, Va., requesting passage of House bill 1112, providing for parol of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1927. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against provisions in House bill 12610; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1928. By Mr. COLE: Petition of the Pomona Grange No. 43, Dola, Ohio, urging the passage of the pure-fabric bill, etc.; also, the Ohio Wool Growers' Association, urging the passage of the pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1929. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Assembly of the National and State Bankers at New Orleans, La., relative to the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1930. Also, petition of the Twenty-eighth War Taxpayers' Protective Association, of Brooklyn, favoring the Lehlbach retirement bill, etc.; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1931. Also, petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, relative to the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1932. Also, petition of the Michael Davitt Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, to safeguard the liberty in our Liberty bonds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1933. By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of John D. Wells, of Rutland, Ohio, favoring the passage of the pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1934. Also, petition of Local Union No. 3918, W. M. W. of A., of Pomeroy, Ohio, against the Sterling-Graham bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1935. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the American Tariff League, relative to tariff revision and the League of Nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1936. Also, petition of the National and State banks of the city of New Orleans, La., relative to the Federal reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1937. By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., protesting against proposed reduction by House Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1938. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce and various other corporations of the city of New York, favoring the maintenance of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1939. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Mrs. S. A. Kessell and 48 other club women, of Oakland County, Mich., opposed to universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1940. By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Fort Madison, Iowa, protesting against the Sterling-Graham bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1941. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the National Enameling & Stamping Co., the Green-Lucas Co., Dr. F. K. Nichols, N. W. Williams, J. E. Teal, Kenneth S. Cullom, the James Edgar Potts Post, No. 2, Maryland Branch of the American Legion, all of the city of Baltimore, Md., favoring universal military training, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1942. Also, petition of William A. Wells Post, No. 1, Maryland Branch of the American Legion, urging a bonus to all service men of a \$50 bond, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1943. Also, petition of the Clothing Manufacturers' Association of Boston, favoring Senate bill No. 3792; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1944. Also, petition of the Export and Import Board of Trade of Baltimore (Inc.), the A. H. Colmary Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring maintaining the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1945. Also, petition of various citizens of the city of Baltimore, Md., favoring a \$480 bonus for the employees of the Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1946. Also, petition of the Real Estate Board of Baltimore, Md., urging the defeat of H. R. 12397; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1947. Also, petition of J. Henry Miller (Inc.), of Baltimore, Md., in favor of H. R. 10708; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1948. Also, petition of Mr. P. Murphy, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the Mason resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1949. Also, petition of Cumberland Union, No. 1024, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Cumberland,

Md., protesting against the Graham peace-time sedition bill, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1950. Also, petition of Niles, Wolff, Barton & Morrow, law firm of the city of Baltimore, Md., relative to promotion in the Navy, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1951. Also, petition of executive committee of the Builders' Exchange of Baltimore, Md., opposing the passage of H. R. 10738; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1952. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of the Polish Citizens' Committee, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1953. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of the Adrain (Mich.) Chamber of Commerce, in favor of 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1954. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the National and State Bankers' Protective Association of Atlanta, Ga., approving the Federal reserve act, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1955. Also, petition of the H. R. Lathrop Co., the George Borgfeldt Co., and the Neumzn & Schwiens Co., all of New York City, favoring maintaining the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1956. Also, petition of Thomas C. Miller, of New York City, in favor of increase in salary for the men in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1957. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the classified employees of the United States navy yard, Mare Island; supply department, State of California; the chief clerk United States naval ammunition depot of Mare Island, Calif.; and Miss Eva L. Ashworth, of San Francisco, Calif., urging the retention of the bonus feature in the legislative bill and raised to \$480; also, James K. Taylor, of San Diego, Calif., urging the same features; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1958. Also, petition of the Los Angeles city association of school-teachers, urging support of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

1959. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the Assembly of the National and State Bankers' Protective Association of Atlanta, Ga., relative to the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1960. Also, petition of the National Sheep and Wool Bureau of America, of Chicago, relative to House bill 11641; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1961. Also, petition of various corporations of the city of New York, urging the maintenance of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1962. Also, petition of the American Woodpulp Corporation, of New York City, urging the retaining of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1963. Also, petition of John W. Gillen, favoring increased compensation for Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1964. Also, petition of Frank J. Fulton, president the Ship Construction & Trading Co., New York City, favoring legislation for adjusting and paying claims of wooden-ship builders; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1965. Also, memorial of the executive committee, United Spanish War Veterans, New York City, opposing 1-cent drop-letter legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1966. Also, petitions of Nafra Co., McElwain, Morse & Rogers, and Eugene Sutter & Co., all of New York City, favoring appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1967. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1968. Also, petition of Henry F. Samstag and P. Pastene & Co. (Inc.), favoring appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1969. Also, petition of the American Jewelers' Protective Association, favoring House bill 11980; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1970. Also, petition of the Piney Branch Citizens' Association, Washington, D. C., urging an addition to the J. R. West School, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1971. Also, petition of Thomas C. Miller, New York City, favoring Army and Navy pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1972. Also, petition of Lorraine Cross Post, No. 392, American Legion, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1973. By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of W. R. Gallagher, of the committee on interstate and foreign commerce, Washington, D. C., favoring an increase in pay for Government employees, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1974. Also, petition of J. L. Boston, of Wartburg, Tenn., regarding the purchase of farms for soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1975. Also, petition of A. R. Tuell, of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1976. By Mr. VARE: Petition of a mass meeting held in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring aid to the Armenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 29, 1920.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WATKINS, of Louisiana].

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We are met, our Father in heaven, on this holy day, to fulfill a sacred duty which springs spontaneously from our hearts; that we may record for future generations the life, character, and achievements of a long-time Member of this House—a born gentleman, one of God's noblemen, who had convictions and dared to live them; a soldier, a statesman, a servant of his people in State and Nation.

At the age of 18 he enlisted in the Confederate Army and served throughout that long struggle with distinction—a brave and gallant soldier; and when the war ended laid down his sword and submitted to the inevitable with the same bravery and nobility of soul which characterized him as a soldier fighting for principles which he deemed right.

He took up the duties of life, became a man of affairs, a leader of men, and was chosen by his people for onerous duties in State and Nation—a loving husband, a tender father who gave to the great World War four stalwart sons. His work is done but his memory lives.

Comfort his family and friends with the immortal hope that sometime in the providence of God they shall meet in a land where sorrows never come, where love will be the crowning glory of a life eternal in one of God's many mansions where Christ has prepared a place for His own; and paeans of praise we will ever give to Thee, our God and our Father. Amen.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be deferred until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the order for the day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. O'CONNOR, by unanimous consent,
Ordered, That memorial services shall be held on Sunday, February 29, 1920, on the life and character of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, deceased.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ESTOPINAL.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following resolutions, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we have assembled here today in accordance with a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, and in pursuance of a custom of parliamentary assemblies and legislative bodies, to commemorate the life, character, and services of the late ALBERT ESTOPINAL, Member-elect to this Congress from the first congressional district of Louisiana. This custom is derived from the past, and its origin is lost in the remoteness of time. For even from the twilight of history there come stories and traditions of great ceremonies